JOHN THE BAPTIST IN LUCAN THEOLOGY

A dissertation presented

by

Erick R. Egertson

to

The Faculty of the Graduate Theological Union
and the Pacific Lutheran Theological Seminary

in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Theology

Berkeley, California
May 20, 1968

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my appreciation to my faculty committee for the time which was demanded of them in order to study this dissertation. Special thanks are due to Prof. Herman C. Waetjen, my dissertation advisor, and to Fr. Ben F. Meyer, S. J., for discussing the subject with me and for their time, their suggestions, and for their patience.

ABBREVIATIONS

BZ,	Biblische Zeitschrift
CBQ,	Catholic Biblical Quarterly
EvTh,	Evangelische Theologie
JBL,	Journal of Biblical Literature
JTS,	Journal of Theological Studies
NovT,	Novum Testamentum
NTS,	New Testament Studies
RB,	Revue Biblique
ThDNT,	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
ZNW,	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZThK,	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
ABBREVIATIONS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
Chapters	
I. THE INFANCY GOSPEL: ITS RELEVANCE TO THE LUCAN REDACTION	4
A. Vocabulary and Style	8
B. Characteristic Themes	18
C. Specific Ties With the Main Body of the Redaction	25
II. THE LUCAN HORIZON	31
A. A Two-Part Work	32
B. Eschatology and Periodization	36
C. Geography and Travel	46
D. Total Structure	50
III. TRADITIONAL MATERIALS AND SPECIFICALLY LUCAN TEXTS ON JOHN	59
A. The Infancy Stories	59
B. Marcan and "Q" Material: Omissions and Alterations	68
C. The Redaction of Chapters Three and Seven	73
1. The Significance of Luke's Additions in Chapter Three	73
2. The Significance of Luke's Omissions in Chapter Three	78
3. The Significance of Luke's Changes in Chapter Three	81
4. The Lucan Redaction of Chapter Seven	83
5. John the Baptist and Elijah	88
6. Lk. 16:16	97
D. Texts in Acts	102

IV. JOHN THE BAPTIST IN LUCAN THEOLOGY 112

A. The Fulfillment of Eschatological Prophecy 112
1. The Malachi Prophecy in Luke-Acts 112
2. The Isaiah 40 Prophecy in Luke-Acts 118
3. John as an Instrument of the Plan of God 123
B. The Temporal Precedence of John and the Witness to Jesus 130
C. The Greatness of John and Jesus 137
1. Their Relation to the Heroes of Old 138
2. Their Relation to the Holy Spirit 141
3. Their Relation to the Most High 144
D. The Function of the Forerunner 149
1. Terms describing John's Work 149
2. John as Witness to the Coming of the Messiah 161
E. The Preacher of Christ and Salvation . . . 163

BIBLIOGRAPHY 175

Introduction

The object of this study is the role assigned to John the Baptist by the author of Luke-Acts. The question is: What significance does John have in Lucan theology? This study is not, then, directly concerned with pre-Lucan tradition; source-critical considerations are relevant exclusively from the redactional standpoint. The aim is to ascertain Luke's own view.

Such a study is immediately suggested by the sheer mass of material in Luke-Acts bearing on John. He is mentioned by name twenty-three times in the Gospel (three times with the title ho baptistês) and nine times in Acts.[1] Besides these passages, John is refered to in the Visitation story as to brephos (1:40, 44), and in the Benedictus as to paidion (1:76). Even if we count only the Gospel, no writer in the New Testament has as much material about John as Luke does. This is evident in the following conspectus of pericopes: (1) pericopes on John which Luke has in common with either Mark or Matthew or both:

3:1-22	The Appearance of John	Mk. 1:1-11;	Mt. 3:1-17
5:33-35	The Fasting Question	Mk. 2:18-19;	Mt. 9:14-15
7:18-23	The Question of John		Mt. 11:2-6
7:24-35	Jesus' Testimony to John		Mt. 11:7-19
9:7-9	Herod's Opinion of Jesus	Mk. 6:14-16;	Mt. 14:1-2
9:18-22	Peter's Confession	Mk. 8:27-33;	Mt. 16:13-23
16:16	The Law and the Prophets		Mt. 11:12-13
20:1-8	The Question of Authority	Mk. 11:27-33;	Mt. 21:23-27

---

[1] Lk. 1:13, 60, 63; 3:2, 15, 16, 20; 5:33; 7:18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 28, 29, 33; 9:7, 9, 19; 11:1; 16:16; 20:4, 6; Acts 1:5, 22; 10:37; 11:16; 13:24, 25; 18:25; 19:3, 4. For comparison, John is named in Mark sixteen times and in Matthew twenty-three times. The title ho baptistês is used twice by Mark, but is favored by Matthew,--seven times.

(2) passages peculiar to Luke:

1:5-25	The Annunciation to Zechariah
1:39-45	The Visitation
1:57-66	The Birth of John
1:67-80	The Benedictus
11:1	Introduction to the Lord's Prayer
Acts 1:5	On the Promise of the Spirit
Acts 1:21-22	On the Beginning of Jesus' Ministry
Acts 10:37	On the Beginning of Jesus' Ministry
Acts 11:16	On the Promise of the Spirit
Acts 13:23-25	On the Completion of John's Course
Acts 18:24-28	On Apollos
Acts 19:1-7	On the Disciples in John's Baptism

Material in Mark and Matthew which Luke does not use, at least in the same form, are Mk. 1:14 (Mt. 4:12) and Mk. 6:17-29 (Mt. 14:3-12) on the arrest and death of John (the arrest is summarized in Lk. 3:19-20). Luke also omits the discussion about the coming of Elijah in Mk. 9:9-13 (Mt. 17:9-13), in which the Matthew parallel mentions John by name (17:13; John is explicitly associated with Elijah in Lk. 1:15-17). Finally, Matthew has a reference to John by way of conclusion to his parable of the Two Sons (21:28-35). The parable is peculiar to Matthew, but the reference to John is similar to Lk. 7:29-30. Luke, in short, has all the material that Mark and Matthew have about John the Baptist with the exception of details on John's death. Beyond this, it is only Luke, of the three Synoptic Evangelists, who has peculiar material to offer on John. This material belongs largely to the Infancy narratives and to Acts.

A second reason for the appropriateness of a study of John in Lucan theology is the simple lack of such treatment in secondary literature. There have been numerous articles and monographs along lines of a quest of the historical John or a survey of Christian traditions about him. The studies of Adolf Schlatter, Martin Dibelius, and Carl Kraeling are examples.[1]

---

[1]Adolf Schlatter, Johannes der Täufer, ed. by Wilhelm Michaelis (Basel: Verlag Friedrich Reinhardt AG, 1956); Martin Dibelius, Die Urchristliche Uberlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911); Carl H. Kraeling, John the Baptist (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951).

There have also been investigations of the Lucan Infancy narratives. Thus, Pierre Benoit has studied the material on John in Luke 1,[1] and Philipp Vielhauer has focused in the Benedictus.[2] Here again, however, the viewpoint is defined by historical and/or source-critical questions (e.g., Vielhauer concludes that the Benedictus originated in a "Baptist" sect and originally celebrated John as a "prophetic Messiah").

Since the advent of redaction criticism the question posed here has been at least summarily treated within the context of broader studies. An important instance is the work of Hans Conzelmann.[3] The broader context is indeed important, for Luke does not present his view of John in isolation. However, Conzelmann's work itself makes the need of concentrated attention to John's role in Luke positively clear. For one thing, Conzelmann simply bypasses consideration of the Infancy narratives.[4] Precisely from the standpoint of redaction criticism this must be considered an oddity. Its operative supposition seems to be that Luke has simply adopted the Infancy stories without bringing them into line with his own theology. As we shall see, recent criticism has found this supposition to be untenable.

As to the specifically Lucan understanding of John, Conzelmann offers the following analysis. In pre-Lucan tradition, John is understood as the forerunner, Elijah, who appears at the dawn of the new eschatological age. Like Mark and Matthew, Luke draws on this tradition, but "his own pronouncements point in another direction."[5] John now marks the

---

[1]Pierre Benoit, "L'Enfance de Jean-Baptiste selon Luc I," NTS, III (May, 1957), 169-194.

[2]Philipp Vielhauer, "Das Benedictus des Zacharias (Luc. 1,68-79)," ZThK, XLIX, 3 (1952), 255-272.

[3]Hans Conzelmann, The Theology of St. Luke, trans. by Geoffrey Buswell (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1960).

[4]Ibid., pp. 18, n. 1; 22, 24, 172, 183.

[5]Ibid., p. 22.

divisions between two epochs and himself belongs to the earlier one. He is not the forerunner but the last of the prophets, --not a beginning but an end.

Even critics who find this thesis congenial have repudiated the deliberate exclusion of the Infancy narratives from consideration. H. H. Oliver, for example, has sought to demonstrate that these narratives are integral to Luke's purpose.[1] Oliver's interest is precisely in "the present form of the nativity stories as reflecting the theology of Luke."[2] The examination itself is carried out in dependence on Conzelmann's themes, and John is accordingly linked with "the Period of Israel."[3]

Again, Paul S. Minear finds curious "the fact that so many recent studies of the Lucan corpus virtually ignore the Infancy narratives, and the twin fact that so many studies of those narratives ignore the rest of the corpus."[4] Against this tendency Minear argues that there is "a massive body of evidence supporting the homogeneity of these chapters within Luke-Acts."[5] Minear points to word statistics, syntactical phenomena, the Zweiheitsgesetz (which R. Morgenthaler studied as an element of Lucan style),[6] and finally to some pervasive Lucan interests and themes.[7] Turning to Conzelmann, Minear writes: "In my judgment the qualifications should take on major proportions. If Conzelmann had taken full account of the nativity stories, I believe his position would have been changed at several major points."[8] "One must conclude that Conzelmann could

---

[1]H. H. Oliver, "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts," NTS, X (January, 1964), 202-226.

[2]Ibid., p. 215. [3]Ibid., p. 216.

[4]Paul S. Minear, "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories," Studies in Luke-Acts, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), 111.

[5]Ibid.

[6]Robert Morgenthaler, Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis (Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1949).

[7]Minear, "Birth Stories," pp. 113-118.

[8]Ibid., p. 120.

arrive at his understanding of Lucan theology only by ignoring or rejecting the evidence provided by the birth narratives."[1] Minear thus goes beyond the critique offered by Oliver. The Infancy stories discourage the assignment of John and Jesus to separate epochs. But Minear maintains that Oliver was right in principle when he observed that Luke could make changes in the Marcan tradition because "the relationship between the two men had already been well established in the birth stories."[2]

W. Barnes Tatum has also dealt with the problem of the relevance of Lk. 1-2 to characteristically Lucan thought, approaching the question by way of the Spirit-motif, as this is central to the whole work.[3] Like Oliver, he accepts Conzelmann's basic conception of Lucan Heilsgeschichte and the relation of John and Israel with little question, except for his conclusion that "whatever his sources, St Luke uses the birth stories to characterize that period in salvation history before the ministry of Jesus as the Epoch of Israel."[4] Tatum, moreover, disagrees with Conzelmann on John the Baptist. John is the precursor; his function is one of preparation.[5]

It is evident from this swift survey that an initial question in a study of Luke's view of John the Baptist must be to specify the material relevant to such a study. Are the Infancy narratives significant for determining Luke's understanding of John?

Still more fundamental to our question is the thesis, widely adopted in the wake of Conzelmann's study of Lucan

---

[1] Ibid., p. 124.

[2] Minear, "Birth Stories," p. 123; Oliver, "Lucan Birth Stories," p. 217. Minear goes on in his article to criticize those who study Lk. 1-2 without reference to the rest of Luke-Acts as though they were alien to the rest (pp. 125ff.).

[3] W. Barnes Tatum, "The Epoch of Israel: Luke I-II and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts," NTS, XIII (January, 1967), 184-195.

[4] Ibid., pp. 185-186.

[5] Ibid., p. 193.

theology and Ernst Haenchen's commentary on Acts,[1] that the Lucan perspective is radically characterized by "de-eschatologization" of the Baptist, of Jesus, and of the Church. This raises a most fundamental issue affecting the totality of Lucan thought as well as the specific question of Luke's view of the Baptist. It is evident that a position on this issue must be clearly defined. In part, the study of Luke's treatment of the Baptist may well function as a test-case for the validity of the Conzelmann/Haenchen hypothesis. But this alone cannot suffice to resolve the issue. Consideration of the total Lucan opus is essential to present the question of eschatology incisively.

We have thus stated two initial and fundamental issues belonging to the strategy of the inquiry: (1) Are the Infancy narratives relevant to distinctively Lucan theology? and (2) How should Luke's total theological horizon be defined?

Once these issues are resolved, the main project,--the understanding of Luke's positive delineation of John's mission and its significance,--remains to be accomplished. It is a redaction-critical project, requiring attention, first, to the material in Lk. 1-2, secondly, to the significance of Luke's omissions and modifications with reference to the Marcan tradition, and to comparative study of parallel material in Matthew; finally, to the significance of material in Acts. The final step will be to determine whether or not a fundamentally unified vision of John emerges; and if so, to say what it is.

---

[1]Ernst Haenchen, Die Apostelgeschichte. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, dritte Abteilung, 14. Auflage (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965).

I. The Infancy Gospel: Its Relevance to the Lucan Redaction

The source-critical problems raised by the opening chapters of Luke's Gospel have never been resolved with full satisfaction.[1] The one incontestable conclusion emerging from the labors of the source critics is that the redactor of the Lucan *opus* has had an active role in their composition. This conclusion is authorized by two strands of evidence. First, the Infancy narratives are permeated with Lucan vocabulary and stylistic traits. Secondly, they are charged with characteristic Lucan themes.

Furthermore, the relevance of Chs. 1-2 to Luke's total work is underscored by a set of demonstrable ties between the Infancy stories and the main body of the redaction. The available evidence warrants the important conclusion that the Infancy narratives not only bear the stamp of Lucan composition and conscious integration with Luke-Acts, but they have been made to reflect central concerns in Lucan theology.[2]

---

[1]For recent surveys of the source criticism of Lk. 1-2, see R. McL. Wilson, "Some Recent Studies in the Lucan Infancy Narratives," *Studia Evangelica*, ed. by Kurt Aland, F. L. Cross, Jean Danielou, Harald Riesenfeld, and W. C. van Unnik ("Texte und Untersuchungen 73"; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), 235-253; Oliver, "Lucan Birth Stories," pp. 205-215. Wilson concludes that those who start from principles of form criticism are almost bound to come up with some form of the Baptist Document Theory; those who examine the narratives as they stand may argue that the whole derives from Luke, using tradition and the Old Testament; but they may not be incompatible.

[2]See Minear, "Birth Stories," ppl 111-130; Paul Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*, ed. by Walther Eltester (2nd ed.; Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1957), 165-186; Jacques Dupont, "Le Salut des Gentils et la signification theologique du livre des Actes," *NTS*, VI (January, 1960), 132-155.

A. Vocabulary and Style

The nineteenth-century critics gave detailed attention to the characteristic vocabularies of the Evangelists. Investigation of the Lucan character of the vocabulary of the Infancy narratives was inspired by this research. Evidence in favor of it was marshalled by Plummer, Hawkins, and Harnack.[1] The more recent studies of Benoit, Morgenthaler, Minear, and others have decisively supported them.[2]

Plummer's analytic vocabulary lists were not specifically organized with a view to establishing the Lucan character of the vocabulary in Chs. 1-2. Minear, however, has exploited them for exactly this purpose, offering a list of significant expressions which appear (1) both in the Infancy narratives and in the rest of Luke-Acts, and (2) more often in Luke-Acts than in the rest of the New Testament:[3]

agalliasis	dialogismoi kardiôn
aggelos kyriou	dianoigein
ainein	dierchesthai
amphoteroi	dounai
anagein	ethos
anistanai	eisagein
antilegein	empimplanai
anth' hôn	exaiphnês
kai autos	exapostellein
aphesis hamartiôn	existanai
aphistanai	eperchesthai
brephos	epipiptein

---

[1]Alfred Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke (5th ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1922); John C. Hawkins, Horae Synopticae (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1899); Adolf Harnack, Luke the Physician, tr. by J. R. Wilkinson, ed. by W. D. Morrison (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1908), 96-103, 199-218.

[2]Benoit, "L'Enfance," pp. 169-194; Morgenthaler, Geschichtsschreibung; idem., Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes (Zürich-Frankfurt am Main: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1958); Minear, "Birth Stories," pp. 111ff.; Vielhauer, "Benedictus," pp. 255-272; N. Turner, "The Relation of Luke i and ii to Hebraic Sources and to the Rest of Luke-Acts," NTS, II (January, 1956), 100-109; M. D. Goulder and M. L. Sanderson, "St Luke's Genesis," JTS, N.S. VIII (April, 1957), 12-30.

[3]Minear, "Birth Stories," p. 113.

episkeptesthai	pais
etos	parachrêma
euaggelizesthai (w. acc.)	plêthos
eulogein ton theos	polis
idou gar	poreuesthai
kathairein	proerchesthai
pas ho laos	prosdechesthai
megalynein	prosdokan
mên	sêmeron
nomizein	skiptan
apo tou nyn	speudein
oikos	dia stomatos
oikoumenê	syllambanein
onomati	synballein
optasia	hypostrephein
	hypsistos

As Minear has supplemented the observations of Plummer, the following list (words appearing at least three times in in Chs. 1-2 and appearing more often in Luke-Acts than in the rest of the New Testament) supplements that of Minear:

anêr	laos
Hierousalêm	pimplêmi
koilia	rêma

Finally, the words enôpion, keimai, and sôtêria appear at least three times in Chs. 1-2 and more often in Luke-Acts than in the rest of the Gospels. They may stand as an illustrative statistic:

	Mt., Mk.	Lk.-Acts	Lk. 1-2
enôpion	0	35	5
keimai	3	6	3
sôtêria	0	10	3

Hawkins, judging an expression to be "characteristic" if it appears (1) at least four times in a given synoptic gospel while not being found in the other two, or (2) at least twice as often in that gospel as in the other synoptics together, tabulated 151 lucanisms. Of these no less than seventy-seven occur in the Infancy narratives.[1] Furthermore:

> The number of verses in Luke i, ii is 132, being rather more than one-ninth of the 1,149 verses into which the Gospel is divided. But they contain 212, ile. almost exactly one-seventh, of the occurrences of the 'characteristic' words and phrases.

---

[1]Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, p. 22.

> So we find here . . . that such expressions are used more abundantly in the first two chapters than in the rest of the Gospel.[1]

In a word: from the standpoint of characteristic vocabulary, the Infancy narratives are more "Lucan" than the rest of Luke.

In parallel columns Harnack presented the text of Lk. 1:5-15 and detailed samples of parallel uses of words and phrases from the rest of Luke-Acts. In a separate appendix he did the same for 1:39-56, 68-79; 2:15-20, 41-52.[2] His conclusion was that Luke could not have copied Chs. 1-2 from a Greek source, but must have either translated from another language or reproduced oral information in his own way.[3]

According to Morgenthaler, Luke has sixty-two prefered words; that is, words which (1) occur at least ten times in Luke, and (2) more often in Luke than in Matthew.[4] Of the sixty-two only sixteen are lacking in Chs. 1-2.[5] Moreover, twenty-four of the seventy-one "prefered words" of Acts are found in these chapters.[6] Morgenthaler used Lk. 2:1-20 as a test case. Of this passage's 310 words, only twenty-two are not to be found in the rest of Luke. On the other hand, twenty-five of the gospel's sixty-two lucanisms occur in this brief text.[7]

Let us now consider stylistic traits, and first of all, some syntactical lucanisms. Egeneto followed by a finite verb occurs seven times in Mark and Matthew, twenty-two times in Luke, of which eight occurrences belong to Chs. 1-2.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 23.

[2] Harnack, Luke the Physician, pp. 96-103, 199-218.

[3] Ibid., p. 101; cf. pp. 96f., 215ff. Harnack also concludes that the Magnificat and Benedictus are works of Luke himself, pp. 215-218; cf. Henry J. Cadbury, "The Speeches of Acts," The Beginnings of Christianity. Vol. V: Additional Notes to the Commentary, ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake (London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd., 1933), pp. 417, 420.

[4] Morgenthaler, Statistik, pp. 50, 181.

[5] Ibid., p. 46.

[6] Ibid., p. 52.

[7] Ibid., pp. 62-63.

Eimi with the dative occurs five times in Mark and Matthew, fifteen times in Luke, of which three occurrences belong to Chs. 1-2. En tô with the infinitive occurs five times in Mark and Matthew, thirty-two times in Luke, of which five occurrences belong to Chs. 1-2. The nominative kai autos occurs nine times in Mark and Matthew, forty-one times in Luke, of which six occurrences belong to Chs. 1-2. Eipen de, eipan de occur only in Luke; of the fifty-nine instances in the gospel, three belong to Chs. 1-2.[1]

Syntax is not the whole of style. Thus, Morgenthaler's conclusion on the Infancy gospel ("durch und durch lukanisch") hinges on his analysis of the typically Lucan Zweiheitsgesetz (the doubling of words, sentences, and sections). Minear's identical conclusion hinges on, among other things, "the historiographical style" (stereotyped introductory formulas, phrases such as egeneto de, interest in times, places, and names) and "the use of speeches, citations, and hymns to serve as 'programmatic entrances' (Bultmann)."[2] The observations on Lucan style offered by both of these critics are extremely valuable. Rather than merely adding to their list of stylistic traits, we now propose to test their final conclusion by a combined vocabulary, stylistic, and thematic analysis of four sample texts in chapter one of Luke.

1. 1:5-25. --In vss. 5-7 the following may be noted. The use of the article in the phrase en tais hêmerais with a proper name is characteristic of Luke (1:5; 4:25; 17:26, 28; Acts 5:37; cf. 7:45).[3] The term amphoteroi occurs eight times in Luke-Acts, six elsewhere (three in Matthew, three in Ephesians). enantion is found only in Luke-Acts in the New Testament (five times); cf. enanti, vs. 8, which is once used in Acts (8:21) and nowhere else. enôpion is a poorly attested variant for enantion here, but cf. vss. 15, 19; it is used above

---

[1]See Hawkins, Horae Synopticae, pp. 14-17.

[2]Minear, "Birth Stories," ppl 115-117.

[3]Benoit, "L'Enfance," p. 170.

all in Luke-Acts (35 times) and Revelation (32 times) and is a mark of the LXX.[1] poreuomenoi is the first instance of one of Luke's favorite words, fifty-one times in Luke, thirty-seven in Acts.[2] kathoti is peculiar to Luke in the New Testament, six times. In vss. 8-14 the hand of Luke is clearly evident. The expressions enanti (cf. Acts 8:21) and kata to ethos (cf. 2:42; 22:39) are peculiar to Luke. The term ethos by itself is a Lucan favorite, occuring ten times (1:9; 2:42; 22:39; Acts 6:14; 15:1; 16:21; 21:21; 25:16; 26:3; 28:17).[3] The phrase kai pan to plêthos hên tou laou proseuchomenon (vs. 10) is a story heightener made up of favorite terms of Luke. plêthos is used by Luke twenty-five times, eight in the gospel, seventeen in Acts. There are seven total in the rest of the New Testament. It has a variety of objects, but primarily it refers to large groups of people present at important events (cf. 6:17; 19:37; 23:27; Acts 2:6; 6:2, 5; 15:12). ochlos is used similarly.[4] The word laos is very common in Luke-Acts (thirty-seven in Luke, forty-seven in Acts; three in Mark, fourteen in Matthew). Frequently Luke writes of "all the people" or "a great crowd of people," and these people are persistently present, especially for decisive events or words. The laos are treated with favor with Luke, but their leaders are the subject of his polemic.[5] The act of praying is also a Lucan emphasis, and deêsis (vs. 13) is found only in Luke among the gospels (cf. 2:37; 5:33). Luke uses agalliasis and the corresponding verb to express "gladness at divine events" (1:44, 47; 10:21; Acts 2:26, 46; 16:34).[6] The noun chara is also used consistently to denote response to

---

[1]Benoit, "L'Enfance," p. 170; Harnack, Luke the Physician, p. 100.

[2]See Morgenthaler, Statistik, p. 181.

[3]Otherwise only Jn. 19:40; Heb. 10:25; cf. Lk. 2:27; 4:16; Acts 17:2.

[4]Cf. Conzelmann, Theology, p. 20f.

[5]E.g., 19:47-48; 21:37-38 and 22:1-2.

[6]Cf. R. C. Leaney, A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke (New York: Harper & Bros., Publishers, 1958), 80.

great events or to repentance (1:14; 2:10; 8:13; 10:17; 15:7, 10; 24:41, 52; Acts 8:8; 12:14; 13:52; 15:3).

In vss. 15-17 the whole phrase kai pneumatos hagiou plêsthêsetai, as Plummer pointed out, is peculiar to Luke. Both elements of the phrase, noun and verb, are characteristic of him.[1] pimplêmi is found twice in Matthew (22:10; 27:48), thirteen times in Luke (1:15, 23, 41, 57, 67; 2:6, 21, 22; 4:28; 5:7, 26; 6:11; 21:22) and nine times in Acts (2:4; 3:10; 4:8, 31; 5:17; 9:17; 13:9, 45; 19:29), but nowhere else in the New Testament. It occurs eight times with reference to the Spirit, so that the Spirit is the primary object of this verb, especially in material received only from Luke (1:15, 41, 67; Acts 2:4; 4:8, 31; 9:17; 13:9).[2] This filling with the Holy Spirit occurs only before and after the ministry of Jesus and gives rise to a crucial statement or to conversion. "Spirit" itself is a major theme of Luke-Acts. The word pneuma occurs thirty-seven times in Luke, seventy-two times in Acts, while the fuller phrase pneuma hagion occurs fifty-three times as compared to thirteen total in Matthew, Mark and John.[3] The association of pneuma and dynamis is also characteristic of Luke (1:35; 4:14; 24:49; Acts 1:8; 10:38). The term epistrephein, which is used twice here of John's function, is used more by Luke than any other writer in the New Testament (1:16, 17; 2:39; 8:55; 17:4, 31; 22:32; Acts 3:19; 9:35, 40; 11:21; 14:15; 15:19, 36; 16:18; 26:18, 20; 28:27; with epi kyrion or epi theon see Acts 9:35; 11:21; 14:15; 15:19; 26:20). The verb proerchesthai, also

---

[1]Plummer, Commentary, p. 14; cf. Harnack, Luke the Physician, p. 101; see 1:41, 67; Acts 2:4; 4:8, 31; 9:17; 13:9.

[2]It is also used in the general sense of "filling something with something" (4:8; 5:7, 26; 6:11; Acts 3:10; 5:17; 13:45; 19:29), to designate the end of a period (1:23, 57; 2:6, 21, 22), and to refer to "fulfillment" (21:27).

[3]For studies of the Spirit, see Heinrich von Baer, Der Heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1926); G. W. H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke," Studies in the Gospels, ed. D. E. Nineham Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957), 159-200.

describing John's function, is used five times elsewhere in Luke-Acts (22:47; Acts 12:10, 13; 20:5, 13) while once in Matthew and twice in Mark as well as once in II Corinthians.

In vss. 18-20 the verb euaggelisasthai is a word favored by Luke, who uses it twenty-five times. It nevers occurs in Mark and only once in Matthew where it is from a citation of Isa. 61:1 (cf. Lk. 7:22). Jesus himself "evangelizes," esp. the "kingdom of God" (4:43; 8:1; 16:16) and "to the poor" (4:18; 7:22). In Acts its object is still the kingdom of God, but now also "Christ", "Lord" (Acts 5:42; 8:35; 10:36; 11:20; 15:35; 17:18) or "the word" (Acts 8:4; 15:35).[1] In the New Testament the expression achri hês hêmeras (vs. 20) is used above all by Luke, as also achri tês hêmeras (tautês)(1:20; 17:27=Mt. 24:38; Acts 1:2, 22; 2:29; 23:1; 26:22; 27:33). anth' hôn is used only by Luke except for II Th. 2:10 (1:20; 12:3; 19:44; Acts 12:23).

In vss. 21-25 examples are not as obvious, but optasia also is used in 24:23; Acts 26:19 and elsewhere only in II Cor. 12:1. Also prosdokaô occurs eleven times, while only five times eleewhere, and the phrase meta de tautas tas hêmeras (vs. 24) is like others in Luke-Acts (Acts 1:5; 15:36; 21:15; 24:24), but has parallels in Hebrews (4:8; 8:10; 10:16). For eplêsthêsan, see above, p. 13.

2. 1:39-45. --A detailed list of examples of Lucan style and vocabulary in the Visitation story is offered by Harnack, among which are the examples which follow.[2] The use of the participle of anistanai with poreuesthai as the main verb is lacking in the other gospels, but common in Luke (1:39; 15:18; 17:19; Acts 8:26, 27; 9:11; 22:10). In vs. 41 both eskirtêsen and brephos, while peculiar to Luke and here determined by the context, appear again in Luke-Acts (6:23; 18:15; Acts 7:19). In vs. 44 idou gar is lacking in the other gospels, but six times in Luke-Acts (1:44, 48; 2:10; 6:23; 17:21; Acts 9:11; cf. II Cor. 7:11), and egeneto hê phônê is common in Luke

---

[1]Cf. Morgenthaler, Statistik, p. 181.

[2]Harnack, Luke the Physician, pp. 199-202.

while not used in the other gospels (1:44; 3:22; 9:35, 36; Acts 2:6; 7:31; 10:13; 19:34).

3. 1:57-66. --For the examples here compare Benoit, "L'Enfance," pp. 170-171. In vs. ouchi, alla is characteristic of Luke (1:60; 2:51; 13:3, 5; 16:30) and occurs three times elsewhere in the New Testament (Rom. 3:27; I Cor. 10:29; John 9:9). The noun syggeneia (vs. 61) occurs elsewhere only in Acts (7:3, 14). The introduction of an indirect question with to ti is characteristic of Luke (9:46; 11:48; 22:23, 24; Acts 22:30) as is the use of the optative mood which follows (an theloi).[1] The word parachrêma (vs. 64) is used by Luke sixteen times of eighteen total in the New Testament (cf. Mt. 21:19, 20). Verses 65-66 consist of phrases characteristic of Luke. rêma is a favorite word[2] and the phrase panta ta rêmata tauta may be compared with 2:19, 51; 7:1; 24:11; Acts 5:20, 32; 10:44; 13:42; 16:38. Likewise, for pantes hoi akousantes, compare 2:18, 47; Acts 5:5, 11; 9:21; 10:44; 26:29. The phrase cheir kyriou is not common, but nevertheless peculiar to Luke in the New Testament (1:66; Acts 11:21; 13:11).[3]

4. 1:67-80. --The Benedictus, while it is a pastiche of biblical verses, nevertheless contains words and expressions characteristic of Luke. epeskepsato is used only by Luke in the New Testament, with God as its subject (1:78; 7:16; Acts 15:14; cf. Lk. 19:44; Acts 1:20 for the noun episkopê). The word sôtêria is more common in Luke-Acts and does not appear in Matthew ar Mark. For the connection of sôtêria (vs. 69) and oikô, Harnack points out the reference in 19:9 (see 1:69, 71, 77; 19:9; Acts 4:12; 7:25; 13:26, 47; 16:17; 27:34; cf. 2:30; 3:6; Acts 28:28).[4] The phrase in vs. 70, kathôs elalêsen . . . prophêtôn autou, has a verbal parallel in Acts 3:21. dia stomatos is used only by Luke in the New Testament (Acts

---

[1]Benoit, "L'Enfance," p. 171.

[2]See Morgenthaler, Statistik, p. 181.

[3]The phrase is used seven times in this construction in Ezekiel, and often the phrase "his hand".

[4]Harnack, Luke the Physician, p. 206.

1:16; 3:18, 21; 4:25; 15:7) as is ap' aiônos (Acts 3:21; 15:18).[1] In vss. 78-79, ex hypsous is used only by Luke in the gospels (24:49), and the idea of hodos is very common in Luke-Acts, though also in Matthew and Mark (cf. Acts 2:28; 16:17).

Verses 76-77 most definitely deal with John and contain a number of Lucan characteristics. hypistos is used by Luke nine times out of fourteen occurrences. Both proporeuesthai and the noun gnôsis are used only by Luke (Acts 7:40; Lk. 11:52). "Forgiveness of sins" is a Lucan expression (eight of eleven cases) and occurs only once in Matthew and in Mark (1:77; 3:3; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 5:31; 10:43; 13:38; 26:18). Compare also the connection in Acts 5:31-32 with tou dounai metanoian tô Israêl and with gnôston in Acts 13:38.[2]

The statement in 1:80 has connections with the rest of Luke's gospel. The first clause is parallel, of course, to 2:40, 52. The second, however, seems to refer forward to 3:2, though here en tais erêmois is in contrast to the singular in 3:2. For the plural, however, see 5:16; 8:29. The phrase heôs hêmeras anadeixeôs autou (sing.) has its parallel, moreover, in the story of Jesus, viz., 9:51: tas hêmeras tês analêmpseôs autou (pl.). The terms anadeixeôs and analêmpseôs seem to refer to the respective destinies of John and Jesus, the one occurring just before the story of Jesus, the other pointing to its outcome.

The example of the hand of Luke in the Infancy narratives given above were all drawn from passages dealing directly with John, but the same can be done for Chs. 1-2 as a whole. The following are a few examples from the remainder of Ch. 1. In 1:30 is the first use of charis in Luke-Acts. While this is very common in the Pauline texts, it is not used

---

[1] Ibid., p. 207; cf. J. M. Creed, The Gospel according to St. Luke (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1930), p. 26, who writes: "It is to be noted that when the canticle, as here, ceases to be a direct echo of O.T. language, characteristic Lucan phraseology appears."

[2] Cf. Benoit, "L'Enfance," p. 189.

at all in Matthew or Mark and only three times in John. In Luke, however, it is used eight times and in Acts seventeen. The verb charizesthai, moreover, is used only by Luke among the Evangelists (7:21, 42, 43; Acts 3:14; 25:11, 16; 27:24), and charitoô, in 1:28, is found elsewhere only in Eph. 1:6.[1] In 1:35 also the interest of Luke is visible. The pneuma hagion is a Lucan main theme. The verb eperchesthai is found seven times in Luke-Acts (1:35; 11:22; 21:26; Acts 1:8; 8:24; 13:40; 14:19) and elsewhere only twice (Eph. 2:7; Jas. 5:1); in Acts 1:8 the subject is again the Holy Spirit. dynamis is in parallel with the Spirit, and the connection of Spirit and power is Lucan (see above). Here, and in vs. 32, are the first occurrences of hypsistou (see above). The use of dio occurs once more in the gospel, but is used eight times in Acts (7:7; Acts 10:29; 15:19; 20:31; 24:26; 25:26; 26:3; 27:25, 34). It occurs once each in Matthew and Mark.[2]

Examination of the Magnificat, 1:46-56, also shows the mark of Luke. While megalynô is common in the LXX, Luke uses it most of all in the New Testament (also 1:58; Acts 5:13; 10:46; 19:17). It occurs three times elsewhere. The phrase apo tou nyn (vs. 48) is Lucan (1:48; 5:10; 12:52; 22:18, 69; Acts 18:6). Outside of Luke-Acts it is found only in John 8:11 (a questionable text) and II Cor. 5:16. The verb kathaireô occurs six times in Luke-Acts, three times elsewhere (1:52; 12:18; 23:53; Acts 13:19, 29; 19:27; Mk. 15:36, 46; II Cor. 10:5). The verb exapesteilen (vs. 53) is used ten more times in Luke-Acts (1:53; 20:10, 11; 24:49; Acts 7:12; 9:30; 11:22; 12:11; 13:26; 17:14; 22:21), and otherwise only in Galatians (4:4, 6). It is found twice more with kenos (20:10, 11). Among the Evangelists only Luke uses hypostrepheim (vs. 56).

---

[1]Cf. M. Cambe, "La Charis chez Saint Luc," RB, LXX, 2 (1963), 193-207.

[2]Cf. L. Legrand, "L'arrière-plan néo-testamentaire de Lc 1,35," RB, LXX, 2 (1963), 161-192.

We are compelled to agree with Benoit when he writes that "il n'est pas douteux, en effet, que les lucanismes sont ici nombreux et remarquables."[1] It should be noted, too, that lucanisms are not limited to transitional passages between pericopes, but pervade whole narratives. Indeed, lucanisms, in the sense both of word-choice and of the broader aspects of style and motif, pervade the entire Infancy gospel.

As Plummer has put it:

> The chief evidence (in itself amounting to something like demonstration) that Marcion abridged our S. Luke, rather than the Evangelist expanded Marcion, is found in the peculiarities and characteristics of Luke's style and diction. These run through our Gospel from end to end, and on the average are as frequent in the portions which Marcion omitted as in the rest. In the first two chapters they are perhaps somewhat more frequent than elsewhere.[2]

B. Characteristic Themes

In the preceding section it was shown that the Infancy narratives as a whole are permeated with Lucan vocabulary and stylistic traits. In the course of that study such Lucan themes as "the Spirit" and "the forgiveness of sins" have been evoked. A more systematic treatment of the evidence bearing on the thematic convergence of the Infancy narratives with the larger Lucan redaction is in order.

Minear pointed out that there are pervasive interests and themes which give evidence of the homogeneity of Lk. 1-2 and the rest of Luke-Acts.[3] He offers a list of eight types of such interests and themes, some of which are the following: common ecclesiological conceptions, epiphany and angels, accent on the fulfillment of God's promises, and the christological shape of the witness.[4] It has often been stated that Luke is

---

[1]Benoit, "L'Enfance," p. 170.

[2]Plummer, Commentary, p. lxix.

[3]Minear, "Birth Stories," p. 115.

[4]Ibid., pp. 115-118.

interested in such themes as salvation, prayer, praise and glorification, thanksgiving, glory, the Holy Spirit, poverty and riches, humility and faith, salvation for the Gentiles, and the christological themes Christ, Lord, Son of God and Savior.[1] These are precisely the same interests which are common in the Lucan Infancy stories. Some examples of these common interests follow.

The Holy Spirit is usually noted as a key theme of the book of Acts, yet it is also one of the most important in the Infancy narratives. In the Annunciation stories the Holy Spirit is the power which determines the character of John and Jesus (1:15, 35). In the narratives as a whole the Holy Spirit evokes prophetic utterance (1:41, 67; 2:27). The expression "filled with the Holy Spirit" (1:15, 41, 67) especially links the theme with Lucan usage in Acts (Acts 2:4; 4:8, 31; 9:17; 13:9).[2]

The theme of salvation is one which is important both in the Infancy narratives and in Luke-Acts as a whole, especially as it relates to Christ and Old Testament prophecy. In the Benedictus the feminine sôtêria is associated with Jesus, proleptically, in 1:69 (a horn of salvation in the house of David), and from this context John the Baptist's task is "to give knowledge of salvation" (1:77). The close association of Jesus and salvation is characteristic of Luke. In the Lucan story of Zacchaeus Jesus' visit to the house of Zacchaeus (19:5) is rephrased as the coming of salvation to his house (19:9). In Acts, salvation is associated with the "name of Jesus" (Acts 4:12) and the preaching about Jesus (Acts 13:26). In the song of Simeon the neuter sôtêrion occurs in an allusion to Isa. 40:5 (2:30). This, too, reflects Lucan

---

[1] E.g., the commentaries of Manson, pp. xx-xxvii, and Plummer, xli-xlviii, and the Introductions, such as A. H. McNeile, An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament (2nd ed., rev. by C. S. C. Williams; Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1953), 14-16.

[2] Cf. the studies of Tatum, "Epoch of Israel," pp. 186ff.; von Baer, Heilige Geist, pp. 50-54.

interest. Isa. 40:5 is cited in the ministry of John (3:6) and occurs again in Acts 28:28 as the ground for the Gentile mission (to which Simeon also points, 2:31f.) so that the Lucan history begins and ends with the theme of salvation for all flesh. Simeon's song also alludes to Isa. 49:6 (2:32). This again is cited in Acts (13:47) as a justification for preaching to the Gentiles.[1]

Other themes associated with the presence of Christ that also occur in Simeon's song are "peace" and "glory" (2:29, 32). Simeon had been preserved from death until he should see the Christ (2:26) and at Jesus' presence he is ready to depart "in peace" (2:29). The Christ to whom he refers is said to be the "glory of Israel" (2:32). The connection of peace and glory with the coming of the Christ is also asserted in the angel's song (2:13-14). Here, when the birth of the Christ is announced (2:11), a "multitude of heavenly host" (2:13) sings "glory in the highest to God, and upon earth peace among men of (his) pleasure" (2:14). Both of these songs point forward to the arrival of Jesus at Jerusalem (19:28-46), which is done in fulfillment of messianic prophecy (Zech. 9:9; Mal. 3:1?), and where his messianic destiny is to be fulfilled (9:31; 13:32-35). At his arrival the (earthly) "multitude of disciples" (19:37) sings "in heaven peace and glory in the highest" (19:38).[2] Simeon's song seems to be a foil to Jesus' judgment on Jerusalem (19:41-44). He was ready to depart in "peace" because his "eyes had seen" salvation. "The things for peace," however, are "hid from the eyes" of Jerusalem (19:42). The judgment of Jesus goes on to say that Jerusalem did not know the time of her visitation

---

[1]For the relation of Jesus and the concept "salvation", cf. Leaney, Commentary, p. 106; W. C. Robinson, Jr., Der Weg des Herrn. Studien zur Geschichte und Eschatologie im Lukas-Evangelium, tr. from manuscript by Gisela and Georg Strecker (Hamburg-Bergstedt: Herbert Reich-Evangelischer Verlag, 1964), 39-43; cf. Dupont, "Salut des Gentils,", pp. 137-138.

[2]Note the double shift between the heavenly and the earthly.

(19:44). "Visitation" is also a theme related to salvation which Luke connects with the presence of Jesus. Thus after the raising of the Widow's Son the people exclaim that "God has visited his people" (7:16; cf. Acts 15:14). This is another theme which occurs in the Benedictus with reference to the coming of the Messiah (1:68, 78).

The angel's song is described as the "praising" of God (2:13) on account of the birth of the Savior. Similarly, the shepherds, when they saw the babe in the manger, "returned glorifying and praising God" (2:20). Luke accents the praising and glorifying of God on account of Jesus throughout the gospel.[1] This had been true of Mark (2:12) and Matthew (9:8; 15:31), but Luke greatly expands the number of occasions on which the people "glorify" God because of Jesus (4:15; 5:25, 26; 7:16; 13:13; 17:15; 18:43; 23:47) and heightens the emphasis with the synonym "praise" (19:37; 24:53). These joyful responses also occur in Acts (2:47; 3:8, 9; 4:21; 11:18; 13:48; 21:20). The consistency between Lk. 1-2 and the rest of Luke-Acts is evident in the act of "blessing God" (1:64; 2:28; 24:53).[2]

Christological themes also reflect interests in common with Luke-Acts as a whole. The title "Lord" is used often by Luke (as is true of Matthew) to refer directly to Jesus. The title kyrios occurs twenty-five times in Lk. 1-2. The majority of these are references to the "Lord God (of Israel)" (1:68; cf. 1:16, 32, 46-47). Apart from the Lucan context the references to John as forerunner of the Lord are also references to God (1:15, 17, 76). These are rendered vague, however, by the first clear statement of Jesus' status as kyrios in 1:43, when the mother of John refers to Mary as "the mother of my Lord." The plainest statement of Jesus' status as kyrios is the angelic announcement to the shepherds in 2:11. There they call Jesus a "Savior, who is Christ the

---

[1] Cf. "give glory" in Lk. 17:18.

[2] The term "glorify" also occurs as an echo of Isa. 52:13 in Acts 3:13.

Lord" (sôtêr, hos estin christos kyrios). The title "Christ" occurs again in the story of Simeon who was awaiting the "Christ of the Lord" (christon kyriou; cf. Lk. 9:20).

While the title "Savior" is also used of the "Lord God" (1:47) Luke uses it twice for Jesus in the speeches of Acts (Acts 5:31; 13:23). As for "Lord" and "Christ" Luke again uses the titles in combination in Acts 2:36 ("God has made him both Lord and Christ"). References to the "Lord Jesus" are common in Acts (1:21; 4:33; 7:59; 8:16; 11:17; 11:20; 15:11; 16:31; 19:5, 13, 17; 20:24, 35; 21:31). A number of these are references to the "name of the (Lord) Jesus" (8:16; 19:5, 13, 17; 21:31), in which name baptism is given (e.g., 8:16; 19:5). It is this "name of Jesus" in which salvation is made available (Acts 4:12). This is significant in that Luke provides the scriptural basis for this concept from Joel 3:5 (Acts 2:21), i.e., "whoever calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved." In Luke's view this means the Lord Jesus. It is in the Lucan interest to show that Jesus is the Christ and that he fulfills the messianic prophecies.[1] He adds that title in Lk. 3:15 so that John's witness to the Stronger One becomes, not only a denial that he himself is the Christ, but a clear statement that the Stronger One, Jesus, is the Christ. Luke's preference for the title "Christ" becomes apparent when he adapts the Marcan passion saying in non-Marcan contexts so that "Son of Man" is made to read "Christ" (Lk. 24:26, 46; Acts 17:3; 26:23).[2]

Other Lucan themes of interest can be likewise enumerated from the Infancy stories, such as the emphasis on prayer and piety (1:6, 10, 13; 2:22, 25, 37), wonder and fear (1:12, 13, 21, 24, 29, 65, 66; 2:9, 18, 33), joy and gladness (1:14, 44, 57; 2:10, 38), the role of women (1:13, 24-25, 28-31, 38, 39-45; 2:19, 36-38, 51), and Jerusalem and the Temple (1:8-11; 2:22-24, 25-27, 36-38, 41-52).

---

[1]Cf. Creed, St. Luke, pp. lxxiii-lxxv.

[2]Lk. 24:7 retains "Son of Man", probably because it is presented in the text as a quotation.

It should also be noted that the element of prefiguration, which Luke uses elsewhere (e.g., 9:28-36 and Acts 1:9-11), has a part in the composition of the Infancy narratives. It has already been seen how the Song of the Angels and the Song of Simeon point forward to the narrative of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem (19:28-46). The story of Simeon has an important prophetic role in that he is the first spokesman for the Gentile mission, but also the prophet of division. In his blessing of God (2:29-32) he says that salvation is prepared "for all peoples," a "light for revelation to the Gentiles, and glory for your people Israel." The reference to "your salvation" (2:30) is drawn from Isa. 40:5, which emerges again in John's ministry (3:6) and at the end of Acts (28:28). Likewise, the allusion to Isa. 49:6 (2:32) emerges in Acts in the words of Paul and Barnabas to the Jews at Antioch (Acts 13:46-48; cf. 26:23; 1:8). Thus Simeon is the first to announce the universal availability of salvation. He says more, however. While he knows "peace" because he has seen God's salvation (2:29-30), in his prophecy to Mary he says that Jesus will cause the "fall and rising of many in Israel" and be a "contradicted sign" (2:34). Simeon is thus the first to announce that Jesus is the bringer of both division and peace (cf. 12:51).

The figures Simeon and Anna are ideals, representative of pious Israel. The references in the stories of Simeon and Anna to the expectation of the "consolation of Israel" (2:25) and the "redemption of Jerusalem" (2:38) stand as foils to the development of Luke-Acts. In Luke-Acts Israel does not receive consolation, and Jerusalem is judged, lamented, and wept over. Simeon's words in 2:29-32 are in sheer contrast to Jesus' words to Jerusalem in 19:41-44. In the course of Luke-Acts it is the division in Israel (2:34-35) which becomes the open door to the Gentiles (2:29-32; cf. 4:16-30; Acts 8:4; 13:41, 44-48; 18:5-11; 28:25-28).[1] It is also that which leads to Jesus' course of suffering, and through it his vindication,

---

[1]The Holy Spirit, however, must lead the way; Acts 10:44-47; 11:15-18.

on which Luke puts the emphasis. Lk. 1-2 proclaims that the messianic hopes are being fulfilled. Yet the emphasis on the redemption of Israel stands in sheer contrast to many of the later passages on the mission to the Gentiles. In the course of the story of Luke-Acts the Messiah is rejected by his own. Luke-Acts begins with Israel, but ends with Paul's words on going to the Gentiles. In this, Luke's story is a tragedy as well as a success story, and Simeon is a spokesman and themesetter of its development.

Lk. 2:41-52 also plays a prefigurative role. This last pericope of the Infancy narratives establishes the identity and destiny of Jesus as the Son of God. His identity as Son of God is expressed negatively by dissociation from his parents (2:48-50; cf. the parenthetic statement of 3:23 and the fact that Mary the mother of Jesus drops out of the gospel story to re-appear in Acts 1:14 as a follower of Jesus).[1] His identity is also expressed in his own words (2:49), and his destiny is expressed by the dei of being in his father's house. This story functions as a prefiguration of what is to come in Jesus' ministry, where he is identified as Son of God (3:22, 38; 9:35), where he dissociated from his family (and country) because of his ministry (4:16-30), and where he is compelled to go to Jerusalem and the Temple (9:31, 51; 13:32-35; 19:45-46). The pattern of 2:41-52 of going to Jerusalem (at Passover time), of entering the Temple, and being found in discussion with the teachers, as well as the reaction of amazement and the lack of understanding of Jesus' own family, reflects the course of Jesus' ministry, especially from 9:51 on. The whole Travel narrative (9:51-19:46) is determined by the compulsion to go to Jerusalem; this journey reaches its culmination with Jesus' seizure of the Temple (19:45-46); then, the last section of Jesus' ministry takes place with his

---

[1] In this connection it should be noted that Jesus was not "lost" in Jerusalem, but that he "stayed behind." This should be taken to mean that he stayed intentionally; cf. his remark in 2:49.

teaching "in the temple" (cf. 2:46; 19:47; 21:37,--not in Jerusalem as in Mark). Here, however, Jesus himself becomes the teacher; but here, too, they were amazed at his answers (2:47; 20:26). Moreover, Jesus was not understood by his own people, not even by his own disciples (2:50; cf. 18:34).

This is sufficient evidence that Lucan themes are themes of decisive importance in the Infancy stories, and that he has used them to express his own theology.

C. Specific Ties With the Main Body of the Redaction

The present purpose is to specify certain particular ties of redactional importance between motifs of the Infancy gospel (particularly those relating directly to John the Baptist) and the main body of the Lucan redaction.

The avenues of investigation are defined by a double question: (1) what elements in the Infancy narratives anticipate developments in the main body of the redaction? and (2) what texts in the main body of the redaction presuppose particular elements in the Infancy narratives?

One fact immediately presents itself for consideration. The Infancy narratives are commonly and correctly described as "parallel stories" of John and Jesus. While it is true that Chs. 1-2 mediate a concentration on the person of Jesus, there can hardly be reasonable doubt that the relationship between John and Jesus is a conscious and leading concern of these chapters. A full evaluation of this concern must await later treatment, but this can be said from the start: The presentation of the Infancy narratives as "parallel stories" anticipates the later definition of relationships between John and Jesus in Lk. 3:15-17; 7:18-35; 16:16; Acts 1:21f.; 10:36f.; 13:24f.[1]

---

[1]In this connection, the order of pericopes is significant, as James M. Robinson has pointed out: "Luke has succeeded in providing an infancy narrative which maintains the temporal precedence of John . . . "; The Problem of History in Mark ("Studies in Biblical Theology 21"; London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1957), 22-23.

There are specific texts establishing that the Infancy narratives deliberately anticipate key developments in the main body of the redaction. It is significant, first of all, that at the end of chapter two there is an apocalyptic formula designed to give the whole of the Infancy narratives an orientation to future fulfillment: "And his mother kept all these things in her heart" (2:51b). The apocalyptic character of the formula was first identified by G. Erdmann.[1] That it refers to the Infancy gospel as a whole rather than to the preceding Temple scene only is evident from its placement after the exit formula of 2:51a (cf. the function of the other exit formulas in 1:23, 38, 56; 2:20, 39). Thus, its function is comparable to that of texts such as Dan. 12:4, 9 and Rev. 22:10. The final sense of the Infancy stories is to be disclosed in the Luke-Acts redaction.

This is clearly enough the sense, too, of the conclusion of the story of John's birth and naming: people "through all the hill country of Judea" heard the story of the birth, the naming, and the blessing of Zechariah, and "laid these things up in their hearts, saying, 'What then will this child be?'" (1:65f.).

The angel had already answered this question for Zechariah:

> He will turn many of the sons of Israel to the Lord
> their God,
> and he will go before him in the spirit and power of
> Elijah,
> to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children,
> and the disobedient to the mind of the just,
> to prepare for the Lord a readied people (1:16f.).

The words allude to the expectation of Elijah in Mal. 3:23f. (cf. Sir. 48:10f.). Full discussion of the Elijah theme must be postponed; but it can be pointed out here that the words of the angel anticipate Jesus' citation of Mal. 3 with reference to John in Lk. 7:27.

---

[1] G. Erdmann, Die Vorgeschichte des Lukas und Matthäusevangelium und Vergils vierte Ekloge (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1932), 20f., 49.

The words of the Benedictus,

> And you, child, shall be called the prophet of the Most High,
> for you shall go before the Lord to prepare his ways,
> to give knowledge of salvation to his people
> in the forgiveness of their sins (Lk. 1:76f.),

similarly anticipate and interpret John's mission. In fact, they do so in careful accord with the typically Lucan accent on John's preaching. In the Lucan perspective, John above all preaches as baptism of repentance (cf. Lk. 3:3; Acts 10:37; and the absence of John in the scene of Jesus' "baptism"). His mission is not to save but "to give knowledge of salvation" (Lk. 1:77). It is preparatory, provisional, future-oriented (Lk. 1:17d, 76; 3:4, 16; 7:27f.; Acts 13:24f.; 19:2-5); hence, Luke's accent on the witness character of his mission (Lk. 3:16f.; Acts 13:25; 19:4).

The Infancy narratives, then, cannot be considered a self-enclosed redactional unit. Their orientation to the future, i.e., to the main body of the redaction, is even more evident in passages concerning Jesus. For example, the prophecy of Gabriel (Lk. 1:32ff.) is fulfilled in the glorification of Jesus and in the numerous testimonies to his messiahship and divine sonship in Luke and Acts. It was noted in the previous section that the titles spoken by the angels to the shepherds, sôtêr and christos kyrios (Lk. 2:11), which Mary keeps in her heart till the moment of fulfillment (2:19), again refer to the future, to Jesus' glorification (cf. esp. Acts 2:36; 5:31); The words of Simeon (2:32, 34f.) evoke Jesus' ministry and passion and the Lucan theology of the world mission.

Conversely, the main body of the redaction looks back to the Infancy gospel. We will here consider the texts on John in particular. Conzelmann found himself constrained from the outset,--at the first verse he commented on, i.e., 3:1,--to acknowledge, contrary to his own thesis, a link between the main body of the redaction and the Infancy prologue. He notes concerning Lk. 3:1 that "the agreement with 1:80 is a

strong argument in support of the view that the prologue formed an original part of the Gospel."[1] He would not consider the "prologue" because of the "geographical conception" it assumes.[2] In other words, Conzelmann regarded the Infancy narratives to be in tension with his theses on Lucan geography. According to Conzelmann, John belongs geographically not to the desert but to "all the region about the Jordan" (3:3).[3] The problem involves the phrase en tê erêmô, which recalls the notice that the child John "was en tais erêmois until the day of his appearance to Israel" (1:80).[4]

In fact the opening verses of Lk. 3 are sown with echoes of Infancy gospel motifs. John is "the son of Zechariah" (vs. 2; cf. 1:5ff.; 1:56ff.). The word comes to him en tê erêmô (vs. 2) where he was waiting according to 1:80. The whole dating of 3:1-2, in fact, refers to the fulfillment of the hêmeras anadeixeôs of 1:80, which is a Lucan sentence (cf. Jesus' "days" in 9:51).[5] John preaches a "baptism of repentance for forgiveness of sins" (vs. 3: cf. 1:77). The citation of Isa. 40:3-5 states the function "to prepare the way of the Lord," already stated in 1:17, 76 (cf. 7:27), drawing together the promises of Isa. 40 and Mal. 3. Luke extends the citation to Isa. 40:5, which relates it to both the beginning and the

---

[1]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 18, n. 1.

[2]Ibid. [3]Ibid., pp. 18-19.

[4]The geographical problem is underscored by the repetition of en tê erêmô in the citation of Isaiah, Lk. 3:4, and again in a saying of Jesus, Lk. 7:24. In the later editions of his work Conzelmann concedes this: "Es ist eine Inkonsequenz, wenn die Wüste sowohl im Zitat 3,4 als in dem Quellenstück (aus Q) 7,24 stehen bleibt." Die Mitte der Zeit. Studien zur Theologie des Lukas. (5th ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1964), 12.

[5]On 1:80, see K. L. Schmidt, Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964 [1919]), 312: "Lk hat diese Worte hingestellt, . . . um vor allem den Anschluss an die weitere Geschichte des Täufers zu gewinnen. Die Aussagen des Verses sind ganz allgemein gehalten (Wachsen und Starkwerden an Geist), die positiven Angaben a) »in der Einsamkeit«, b) »bis zu seinem Auftreten« sind dem Überlieferungsstoff 3,1ff. entnommen."

end of Luke-Acts. It recalls 2:30, in which Simeon sings that "my eyes have seen your salvation," but it also points forward to Acts 28:28, where Paul declares that "this salvation of God is sent to the Gentiles." The citation of Isa. 40:5 also takes up 1:77, whereas the beginning of the citation took up 1:76. John's task as stated in 1:76-77 thus provides a framework for the Isa. 40 citation in 3:3-6. Isa. 40:5a (kai ophthêsetai hê doxa kyriou) is not included in the citation. This is often regarded as accidental, or in the interest of emphasis on "salvation" in 40:5b.[1] But since the whole passage has a future reference it may have been deliberately deleted, because the doxa kyriou has already appeared in 2:9, and thus that prophecy is already fulfilled. All of 3:1-6, therefore, is tied to Chs. 1-2. John's "day" (1:80) has come and he sets out to perform his proper function. His teaching follows in 3:7-14.

In 3:15 the question about the coming of the Messiah arises. The question about the Christ there is provided by Luke, and recalls the use of the same title in 2:11. The separation of the wheat from the chaff in vs. 17, though also in Matthew, has the same theme as the prophecy of Simeon in 2:34-35. But, above all, 3:21-22 is a fitting climax to all of 1:5-3:20. The "son" reference recalls the emphasis on Jesus' sonship to God in the Infancy narratives, i.e., 1:32-35; 2:49; These verses represent an affirmation to Jesus of the messianic status which Chs. 1-2 claimed for him, and the commission to begin his ministry (cf. Isa. 41:1; 61:1ff; Lk. 4:16ff.). John has fulfilled his destiny (3:15-18, 19-20; cf. Acts 13:24-25), but Jesus' "must" (cf. 2:49) remains before him. Hence the story of Jesus "begins" at 3:23, starting with the genealogy and the withdrawal of Satan.[2]

---

[1]Cf. L. H. Brockington, "The Septuagintal Background to the New Testament Use of DOXA," Studies in the Gospels, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957), 6.

[2]This was noted long ago by Alfred Plummer. See his note on the position of the genealogy in Luke, Commentary, p. 101.

These observations establish the view that the Infancy stories are part and parcel of the total Lucan redaction. Chs. 1-2 are Lucan in vocabulary, syntax, and style; they are Lucan in theme; and they are related at numerous points to the substance of the gospel and Acts. Two conclusions impose themselves: (1) contrary to the Conzelmann hypothesis, it is not possible to deal adequately with the theology of Luke without taking the Infancy stories into serious consideration; (2) these stories fundamentally relate to the main body of the redaction as the anticipation of events to the reality of events, or as prophecy to fulfillment.

II. The Lucan Horizon

> Commonly, a horizon is the limit of what can be seen from a given point. A horizon has two poles, the subject and what the subject can observe. But as I am now using the word, a horizon also indicates a dynamic orientation, for the human subject is not stationary. He moves through many and varied experiences, gains new insights, sometimes is led by experience to shift those criteria of relevance and evidence that guide his view into the future.
>
> -Michael Novak, "The Christian and the Atheist" Christianity and Crisis, March 21, 1966.

In a literary composition, as in a motion picture, one sequence may grow from another according to whatever principle of order the writer chooses, and the "horizon" or total view of the writer can be identified only when one has considered the whole of his work, read it through to the end, seen all that went before in the light of the end, and grasped something of the artistry that holds the whole together.

The success of the redaction critic turns on the accuracy with which he identifies the redactor's distinctive horizon. This is not reducible to the successive horizons of the parts of his work. It involves an understanding of the redactor's goal, and it especially requires that one discover the dynamism drawing the parts and their sequence toward the achievement of this goal. What are the things that engage or even obsess the author? What does he want his work to accomplish in the reader? What is the whole that he wants the reader to see, and what new thing or in what new perspective does he want him to see?

The literary organization mediates the meaning. The meaning of single sentences or passages or sections inevitably loses force when the sentences, passages, or sections are removed from their circles of context, or when these varied contexts have failed to register on the reader. The fundamentalist's reading is a commonplace example of such mutilation of meaning. By contrast, the redaction critic aims at the most exact understanding of context; hence his characteristic interest in questions of structure. The following outlines structural keys to meaning in Luke-Acts.

A. A Two-Part Work

The most obvious observation on the structuring of Luke-Acts is that it is a two-part work. The basis for this structuring would also seem to be obvious: the first book offers a history of Jesus; the second, a history of the Church.

The division into two books, however, has a more precise theological sense specified clearly by the author himself and designed to accent the continuity of the two parts, --indeed, to accent the indispensability of Acts to the author's intention. The relevant evidence for this, as Paul Schubert and Jacques Dupont in particular have pointed out, is found in the gospel, in Ch. 24.

> "These are my words which I spoke to you while I was still with you, that everything written about me in the law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms must be fulfilled." Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures, and said to them, "Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead, and that repentance for the forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem (Lk. 24:44-47).

It should be noted that this passage has both a forward and backward look. The prophecy of death and resurrection is repeated from the ministry of Jesus (9:22; 18:31-34) and was enacted as reported in Lk. 22-24. "Repentance for the forgiveness of sins" is reminiscent of the ministry of John (3:3).

The reference to "repentance," "forgiveness of sins," "preaching in his name to all nations," and the "beginning from Jerusalem," and even the title "Christ," sets forth themes to be taken up and developed in Acts. All of this is governed by the statement that he "opened their minds to understand the scriptures." The Lucan rubric is "Thus it is written . . . " Thus while Luke ends a book at Lk. 24 he also informs the reader that the story is not yet over.

Paul Schubert, in his study of Luke 24, has shown that the unifying theme of the chapter is the emphasis on proof from prophecy, and further that "proof-from-prophecy" runs like a red thread throughout Luke-Acts.[1] Jacques Dupont has also noted Lk. 24 as a key chapter in Luke-Acts, especially in that it grounds both the mission of Jesus and the mission of the church in the fulfillment of Scripture.[2] Luke 24:44-49 specifies three points of messianic prophecy,--suffering, resurrection, proclamation to the nations (cf. Paul, in Acts 26:23). Acts 28, compared with Luke 24, is mutually illuminating. It also bases the mission of the church in Scripture.[3] Similarly, Acts 1:8 is related to Luke 24, but is more precise. The specific reference to the "end of the earth," like Acts 28:28, grounds the universal mission of the church in Scripture, i.e., Isa. 6:9; 49:6 (cf. Acts 13:46-47).[4] Thus the mission to the Gentiles in Luke-Acts is given structural grounding by the relating of the beginnings and ends of the two books (Lk. 3/Acts 28; Lk. 24/Acts 28; Lk. 24/Acts 1) by the category of prophecy and fulfillment. Hence Acts is a necessary complement to the gospel.[5] The geographical movement in Acts from Jerusalem to Rome is at the same time a

---

[1]Paul Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann, ed. by Walther Eltester (Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1957), 165-186.

[2]Jacques Dupont, "Le Salut des Gentils et la signification theologique du livre des Actes," NTS, VI (January, 1960), 132-155.

[3]Ibid., pp. 137-138. [4]Ibid., pp. 140-141.

[5]Ibid., p. 141.

movement from the world of the Jews to that of the Gentiles.

> Et c'est précisément ce qui interesse Luc. Avec une insistance remarquable, il souligne que l'evangélisation des Gentils n'est pas simplement le résultat dde circonstances fortuites; voulue par Dieu, elle réalise les prophéties annonçant que le Messie apporterait le salut aux nations païennes. Elle fait donc partie integrante du programme assigné au Christ par les Ecritures.[1]

It is evident that the basic theological category which provides the continuity of the two books Luke and Acts, and with which Luke develops his theology, is the category Prophecy and Fulfillment. This can be shown for the Infancy narratives, the ministry of John, the mission of Jesus, and the mission of the church. The following brief survey should make this clear.

For the Infancy narratives, Schubert already argued that the "proof-from-prophecy" theology "pervades the infancy stories of chapter 1 and 2."[2] Minear likewise noted that the characters of Lk. 1-2 "all speak of the same salvation. It is God's fulfillment of his promises to which they all point."[3] The Infancy stories serve both to recall the prophecies of the Old Testament which are to be fulfilled, but also as the new vocalization of the prophecies with specific reference to the fulfillment. Thus, the character and mission of John the Baptist is described by recalling Mal. 3:1, 22-23 and Isa. 40:3 (1:15-17, 76), and the prophecies are applied specifically to him. Similarly, Jesus' character is described in terms of the old Davidic hope (1:32-35). These expressions in turn point ahead to the actual ministries of John and Jesus in which the prophecies are fulfilled. Likewise, Simeon recalls the old prophecies of the conversion of the nations, giving new expression to the prophecies, and relating them to the appearance of Jesus (2:29-33), thus pointing ahead to the fulfillment

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 135-136.

[2] Schubert, "Luke 24," p. 178.

[3] Minear, "Birth Stories," p. 119.

of the Gentile mission in Luke-Acts. The Infancy stories are therefore related to the rest of Luke-Acts as prophecy to fulfillment.

The missions of John, of Jesus, and of the church to the nations are shown by Luke to be the fulfillments of prophecies which he quotes directly. The ministry of John is based on the full quotation of Isa. 40:3-5 (Lk. 3:4-6) and Mal. 3:1 (Lk. 7:27). The early ministry of Jesus (Lk. 3:23-9:50) is based on Isa. 61:1-2 (Lk. 4:16-21; cf. 7:18-23). The necessity with which Jesus must go to Jerusalem for suffering and vindication (9:51-24:52; Acts 1:1-11; see Lk. 24:26) also is given specific scriptural basis. Jesus' innocent suffering is based on Isa. 53:12 (Lk. 22:37) and 53:7-8 (Acts 8:32-33). The resurrection of Jesus is based on Ps. 16:8-11 (Acts 2:21-28; 13:32-37) and the exaltation on Ps. 110:1 (Acts 2:34-35). Finally, the mission of the church to the Gentiles is fully documented from Scripture, i.e., Isa. 40:5 (Lk. 3:6; Acts 28:28), Isa. 49:6 (Acts 1:8; 13:46-47). For both of these, cf. the Simeon prophecy, Lk. 2:30, 32.

These prophecies are also used by Luke at key structural points of his history. An inclusion is formed, for example, by the use of Isa. 40:5 at both the beginning of the time of fulfillment in John's ministry (Lk. 3:6) and at the end of Acts (28:28). Isa. 40:5 thus provides Luke with a rationale for his history. Prophecies of the eschatological work of the Holy Spirit also come into play. Thus Jesus' anointing by the Spirit according to Isa. 61:1 (Lk. 3:23, interpreted by 4:16-21) inaugurates his mission, while the outpouring of the Spirit on Pentecost according to Joel 3:1-5 (Acts 2:17-21) inaugurates the mission of the church.

Luke also used other terminology to express the category Prophecy/Fulfillment. His use of dei, for example, is entirely synonymous with the idea of Scripture fulfillment. This can be seen by comparing Lk. 9:22 with Lk. 18:32-33. Similarly, the "definite plan and foreknowledge of God" (Acts 2:23) is nothing other than that which is laid down in Scripture. More detailed treatment of these terms will be given later.

In examining these prophecies on which Luke has based his work two definite themes can be seen to be central, viz., the coming of the Christ (Isa. 61:1; Isa. 40:3; Isa. 53:7-8, 12; Joel 3:5) and the resultant presence of universal salvation (Isa. 40:5; Joel 3:5; Isa. 49:6). Luke-Acts, therefore, is Luke's interpretation of the coming of Christ and of salvation as they take place according to the plan of God which is laid down in Scripture.

B. Eschatology and Periodization

Luke has honestly grappled with Christianity as an historical movement and treated the time of judgment, the Parousia, as non-imminent. The end-time is defered to the indefinite future (see Lk. 19:11-27; Acts 1:6-7; Lk. 21:34-36; cf. Lk. 12:40; 17:20-21, 26-30; 3:7-14). The question which imposes itself is this: inview of the character of Luke-Acts as history, the story of a continuing movement, and of Luke's treatment of the Parousia as belonging to the indefinite future, how has Luke understood eschatology? What has become of the eschatological character of primitive Christianity in Luke-Acts?. Is eschatology repudiated in favor of history?

The hope of Israel centered on Yahweh's definitive act of salvation, which would bring the paradoxes and conflicts of the human situation to an end. These two factors, God's saving act and the end of human history, were seen in conjunction. Together they defined the Eschaton. History and eschatology, therefore, were in tension.

In the early Christian consciousness, the definitive saving act of God was accomplished by the work of Christ. His death and resurrection grounded the early Church's hope for the swift advent of the Son of Man. With the passage of time, however,--that is, with the "delay of the Parousia--it became clear that the Christian community had to accomodate itself to its real situation. Luke-Acts bears the stamp of this accomodation. It might be called "Luke's eschatological adjustment."

What did it consist in? Did Luke dissociate "eschaton" from the saving act of God and identify it with the end of time (now postponed indefinitely), thus "de-eschatologizing" the missions of John, Jesus, and the church? Or did he retain the tie between eschaton and saving act, redefining "the last days" in terms of ongoing history, thus interpreting the missions of John and Jesus in an eschatological light?

For Conzelmann, the eschatological events have been submerged into the course of history by Luke. Conzelmann uses the term "eschatological" to stand for the end-time which breaks into time and shatters history. Eschatology and history are in tension and mutually exclusive. Since eschatology means the end of time, and since the end-time is defered, then, according to Conzelmann, Luke must de-eschatologize the events he describes as history. Lucan theology has an uneschatological character. Conzelmann is able, therefore, to quote Vielhauer favorably: "How uneschatological Luke's thinking is is proved not only by the contents, but by the very fact of the Acts of the Apostles."[1] Luke, in other words, has historicized eschatology.

Conzelmann's view is that since the Eschaton means the end of time the deferment of the Parousia has led Luke to the replacement of eschatology. Luke replaces it with a schematic Heilsgeschichte, the basis of which is the idea of the Plan of God. "Luke in fact replaces the early expectation by a comprehensive scheme of a different kind."[2] This view is also expressed by Käsemann: "Primitive Christian eschatology is replaced by salvation history, which is characterized by an historically verifiable continuity and by a process of ever-extending development . . . ."[3]

---

[1]Philipp Vielhauer, "Zum 'Paulismus' der Apostelgeschichte," EvTh, X (1950/51), 13. Also in Studies in Luke-Acts, p. 47. Cited by Conzelmann, Theology, p. 14, n. 1.

[2]Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 96, 131.

[3]Ernst Käsemann, "The Problem of the Historical Jesus," Essays on New Testament Themes (London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1964), 28.

These points of view are true only under the presupposition that eschatology stands for the end of time and that history and eschatology cancel each other out. From the other perspective, however, eschatology is not replaced by history, but rather history is now being shaped by eschatology. Luke's view is one which sees history characterized by eschatological events. Thus Luke-Acts would be thought of as eschatological history, or eschatological time.

One passage which points to a solution in this light occurs in Acts as an interpretation of the outpouring of the Spirit, i.e., the quotation of Joel 3:1ff.

> kai estai en tais eschatais hêmerais, legei ho theos ekcheô apo tou pneumatos mou epi pasan sarka . . . (Acts 2:17).

Franz Mussner has pointed out the eschatological significance of Luke's use of this prophecy: in accord with the sense of the original Joel passage, "the last days" are the days prior to "the day of the Lord."[1] But for the theology of Luke the important difference is that "the last days" are not immediately followed by the "day of the Lord."[2] That is the Lucan adjustment. The time of the day of the Lord is unknown. By his own authority the Father has fixed "times and seasons," and it is not for the church to decipher them beforehand.

The outpouring of the Spirit, however, is explicitly eschatological. In this way the church is armed for an equally eschatological task,--the mission to the nations of the world. The tension between eschatology and history is dissolved. Luke has set about writing a history of eschatological events in fulfillment of prophecy.

Luke's use of the theological schema Prophecy/Fulfillment stands in opposition to the hypothesis of "de-eschatologizing". This latter hypothesis involves a supposition warranted by nothing in the work of Luke, namely, that all these

---

[1]Franz Mussner, "'In den letzten Tagen' (Apg 2,17a)," BZ, V (July, 1961), 263-265.

[2]Cf. the distinction between the "day of the Son of Man" and "days of the Son of Man" in Lk. 17:22ff.

eschatological prophecies which had come to fulfillment in John, in Jesus, and in the world mission, have been stripped of their eschatological character. Luke-Acts is written as a movement characterized by a series of definitive events. In these events the eschatological prophecies are fulfilled. The history Luke writes thus has a patterned schematization; but the schematization is the result of eschatological fulfillment. It is the fulfillment of eschatological prophecies in decisive events which shape history and open salvation to all flesh. All of the primary missions described in Luke-Acts,--the mission of John, of Jesus, of the church--are fulfillments of eschatological prophecy.

Luke's whole story has an eschatological color. Even in the Infancy narratives this is true. The characters there are the pious ones of Israel who await redemption, and they focus on the two who will fulfill eschatological prophecies (1:15-17, 32-35). The Holy Spirit becomes a primary eschatological factor in the story, in causing the resurgence of prophecy, in anointing the Messiah, in the Pentecost outpouring, and as guide of the Gentile mission. Eschatological events, therefore, occur in an ordered series of fulfillments. Luke's basic scheme of Prophecy/Fulfillment <u>is</u> his eschatology. His history of salvation has its continuity in the fulfillment theme, its discontinuity in the occurrence of definitive eschatological fulfillments. From this perspective, it is not true that Luke has historicized eschatology. Luke, rather, has written an eschatological history.

How has Luke structurally schematized his history of eschatological events? He has given careful consideration to to the time factor. James M. Robinson's observation that even in the Infancy narratives Luke retained the temporal precedence of John was noted above. This is true of his redaction of Mark. It is contended here that in 3:1-22 Luke has consciously integrated his sources, so that Chs. 1-2 and 3:1-22 together constitute his first section, in which the temporal precedence of John is maintained.

It is just where Luke takes up Mark that he begins to modify Mark. In Mark, John the Baptist was at the "beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ" (Mk. 1:1). Luke has left this statement out. He tells the story of the Baptist's ministry and Jesus' reception of the Spirit, and then tells us that Jesus was "about thirty years old when he began" (3:23). After that comes the Genealogy. In this way a significant change is made by Luke. In Mark, the Baptism (Mk. 1:9-11) and Temptation (Mk. 1:12-13) are closely related. The Spirit descends on Jesus and drives him immediately into the wilderness. After that Jesus is ready for his ministry, which Mark outlines programmatically in Mk. 1:14-15. This is not the case in Luke. In Luke, Jesus "begins" (3:23) after his reception of the Spirit. The Temptation narrative is separated from this and drawn closer to Jesus' appearance in Galilee (cf. Lk. 4:14 and Mk. 1:14). Luke thus has ripped Mark apart to insert the Genealogy before the Temptation. At Jesus' beginning his credentials are presented. The effect of this redaction is to separate the Temptation from the story of the Baptist and set it into closer relationship to Jesus' ministry. It becomes the first incident of Jesus' activity, at which time Satan is overcome and forced to withdraw (4:13).[1]

Moreover, John's "exit" is placed prior to Jesus' "baptism". With the addition of 3:19-20 we have in effect the whole ministry of John described all together and finished. This completion of John's story immediately follows his witness to the coming of the Stronger One. Only then does Jesus appear to receive the Holy Spirit and confirmation of his divine Sonship (3:21-22). The syntactical structure of the Lucan "baptism" story makes the accent fall on the descent of the Spirit and the voice from heaven. The sense of the scene is the messianic anointing of Jesus, and it formally inaugurates Jesus' "time." Only then does he "begin" (3:23), and then the whole ministry of Jesus is described.

---

[1]Cf. Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 16, 28. Cf. 22:1ff., where Satan becomes active immediately after the completion of Jesus' ministry.

There is every indication that Luke understands John's relation to Jesus not only functionally, but temporally also. John comes before Jesus in time. The order of events (ministry of John, witness to the coming of the Stronger One, completion of the ministry of John, coming of Jesus) in Lk. 3:1ff., is reflected also in Luke's statements in the speeches of Acts (10:37; 13:24-25).[1] The composition of this first section is determined by this temporal understanding of John's function in relation to Jesus. Thus Jesus "begins" when John's "course" is completed (Acts 13:25). John always appears first and bears witness to the Stronger One who always follows. The time of John and his preaching is distinctly set off from that of Jesus and the Kingdom. Within the continuity of eschatological fulfillment stand sharply differentiated moments.

It is thus just as true of Luke as it is of Matthew that the Genealogy is placed at the beginning of the story of Jesus. Its very position is indicative of the way Luke separates the stories of John and Jesus and associates the ministry of John with the preceding time. The significance of this position for the Genealogy was noted long ago by Alfred Plummer.

> Why does Lk. insert the genealogy here instead of at the beginning of his Gospel? It would only be a slight exaggeration to say that this <u>is</u> the beginning of his Gospel, for the first three chapters are only introductory. The use of <u>archomenos</u> here implies that the Evangelist is now making a fresh start. Two of the three introductory chapters are the history of the Forerunner, which Lk. completes in the third chapter before beginning his account of the work of the Messiah. Not until Jesus has been anointed by the Spirit does the history of the Messiah, i.e., the Anointed One begin; and his genealogy then becomes of importance.[2]

The Genealogy may have another function at the beginning of Jesus' story also, in relation to the Temptation story.

---

[1]See Ulrich Wilckens, <u>Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte</u> (2nd ed.; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1963), 101ff.

[2]Plummer, <u>Commentary</u>, p. 101.

The Genealogy of Luke takes Jesus' line all the way back to Adam (3:38c) and then to God (3:38d). Jesus is thereby associated, not only with the Davidic line (3:31), but with all of humanity. It is likely that it is to be understood as the Genealogy of the second Adam.[1] It is the second Adam, then, who undergoes temptation in 4:1-13 and who is victor over it. Jesus is thus the antitype of the first Adam and prototype of Christians in temptation.[2] Jesus thus represents Adam as God willed him to be.[3] His victory over temptation forces Satan to withdraw for the duration of his activity (4:13; 22:3).[4]

---

[1]See Helmut Flender, St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History, trans. by Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967), 165; William Manson, The Gospel of Luke (New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1930), 35; Walter Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Lukas. Vol. III of Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament (2nd ed.; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1961), 111.

[2]This is argued by A. Feuillet, "Le recit lukanien de la tentation (Lc 4,1-13)," Biblica, XL, 3 (1959), 613-631; cited by Flender, St. Luke, p. 55, n. 1.

[3]Flender, St. Luke, p. 165.

[4]Two objections might possibly be made against the contention that Luke integrates Chs. 1-2 and 3:1-22, thus structuring an opening section which climaxes with the anointing of Jesus. The one is that there is not only a source break between Chs. 1-2 and Ch. 3, but redactional indications that the parallels of John's and Jesus' Infancy stories close out at the end of Ch. 2. These are 1:80 (John) and 2:40, 52 (Jesus). The result would be a structure in which there is a Prologue (1-2) followed by the two ministries, in which John's ministry is first narrated completely before Jesus' is taken up (3:1-20; 3:21ff.). The other objection is that the end of the first section of Luke is at 3:20, not 3:22. The Spirit theme is tied to both the Temptation and Nazareth pericopes so that 3:21-22 is part of the prelude to Jesus' ministry. A break is made at 3:20 by the "exit" technique (cf. 1:23, 38, 56; 2:39, 51). The following considerations speak to these objections.

On the first point, it is true that the parallel statements 1:80 and 2:40, 52 close out the Infancy parallels (2:40, 52 also form an inclusion in the story of the twelve year old Jesus). But thematic and redactional points also link the Infancy parallels to the ministry of John and to the anointing of Jesus, so that 3:1-22 stands as the demonstration that the hopes and prophecies of Chs. 1-2 are true and taking effect. Lk. 1:80 is itself a direct link with the ministry of John

Luke also makes a precise distinction between Jesus' time and that of the Church, and, in fact, presents Jesus'

---

taken up in 3:1-2. Also the story through 3:22 is characterized by a series of historical references (1:5; 2:1; 3:1-2) which progressively link the story with the history of Israel (1:5), of Rome (2:1), and both Israel and Rome (3:1-2). As for thematic links, the Infancy narratives describe John as the Forerunner of the Lord and Preparer of the Way (1:15-17, 76-77) and these themes about John are taken up in 3:1-20. At the same time Jesus is described as the one who will be the Messiah (2:11, 26) and will be called Son of God (1:35), and 3:21-22 tells of his anointing and his being called "Son." It is this last event that changes the direction of the story. To return to the parallel statements 1:80 and 2:40, 52. In actual fact it is 1:80 and 2:40 which are truly parallel in form and wording, while 2:52 is independently different. The whole Infancy narrative, furthermore, can be paralleled only up to 2:40. Lk. 2:41-52 is without parallel in the Infancy stories about John. This scene about Jesus prefigures his ministry and confirms his identity and destiny. Thus the Infancy parallels close out at 2:40. After that the story prefigurative of Jesus' course is followed by the fulfillment of John's course.

As for the second objection it is true that 3:21-22 has thematic connections with the pericopes which follow. The Nazareth pericope, in fact, is rightly regarded as an interpretation of the event described in 3:21-22. It is also true, however, that 3:21-22 is tied to the chapters which precede. While the messianic outpouring of the Spirit links it with Jesus' ministry and 4:16ff., the heavenly voice which claims Jesus' as Son links it to the Infancy stories. There Jesus' birth announcement is spoken in terms of sonship (1:32-35) and his journey to Jerusalem and the Temple foreshadows his mission as the Son. The prophecy of 1:35 ("he shall be called Son of God") may be understood as being fulfilled in 3:22. Lk. 3:21-22 is in a sense suspended between the preceding and succeeding narratives. It has a pivotal character in the Lucan story in that it both climaxes the hopes of Israel for the Messiah who brings salvation (1:69; 2:11, 30) and the preparation of John who proclaimed the Messiah and salvation (3:4-6, 15, 18), and at the same time provides the basis on which the story of the Messiah and salvation begins (3:23; 4:14ff.). The anointing of Jesus, thus, stands as the line of demarcation between messianic prophecy and messianic fulfillment. Structurally, Luke ties it more closely to the preceding material as its dramatic climax. The wording of 3:23 and the Genealogy which follows marks a new beginning. In 3:21, however, the reference to the baptism of the whole people maintains a continuity with John's ministry, showing that his task was completed. Lk. 3:21-22, as high point of the old section and basis for the new section, is an example of the dramatic structuring of the material which Luke achieves at various turning points in Luke-Acts.

time and the church's time in analogous forms. We may begin by noting that the clearest and most universally accepted structural break in the Lucan material is at Lk. 9:51. This verse reads:

> Egeneto de en tô symplêrousthai tas hêmeras tês analêmpseôs autou kai autos to prosôpon estêrisen tou poreuesthai eis Hierousalêm.

Acts 2:1 is very similar:

> Kai en tô symplêrousthai tên hêmeran tês pentêkostês ēsan pantes homou epi to auto.[1]

These verses are indicative of Luke's structural distinctions on the basis of temporal considerations. His "time-conditioned" structure can be briefly sketched out as in the following paragraphs.

The overall periodization in Luke-Acts is especially marked by the activity of the Holy Spirit. John the Baptist had been filled by the Spirit from his mother's womb (1:15) for his task. Jesus was anointed by the Spirit. The opening of Jesus' activity in 3:23-4:30 is an interpretation of 3:21-22 according to Isa. 61:1ff. During Jesus' story the Spirit's activity is limited to him. Finally, the mission of the church (Acts 2:1ff.) is opened by the outpouring of the Spirit according to Joel 3:1ff. The opening of Jesus' story and of the church's story are thus made to correspond.[2] C. H. Talbert correctly points out that "examination of the framework of the Lucan picture of Jesus reveals that there are two focal

---

[1]Note that there is also such an expression refering to John's time, Lk. 1:80!

[2]Cf. Walter Grundmann, "Der Pfingstbericht der Apostelgeschichte in seinem theologischen Sinn," Studia Evangelica, II, ed. F. L. Cross ("Texte und Untersuchungen 87"; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964), 587. The following points of comparison may be made: (1) in Luke Jesus is anointed by the Spirit, in Acts the Spirit is poured out on the disciples; (2) in each case Scripture on the reception of the Spirit is fulfilled (Isa. 61:1ff.; Joel 3:1ff.); (3) in Luke the mission of Jesus is initiated, in Acts the world mission of the apostles is initiated; (4) in Luke Jesus is rejected by his own people (Nazareth), in Acts the disciples are rejected by their own people (Jerusalem). Also see Dupont, "Salut des Gentils," pp. 141-146.

points in his narrative, ascension and baptism."[1] Moreover, the correspondence of Acts 2:1 with Lk. 9:51 shows that Luke intended a decisive break at the day of Pentecost.[2] The expression Lk. 9:51 refers to the whole period up to the Ascension in Acts 1. Flender has shown that Luke's use of the plural "days" in 9:51 and 17:22ff. stands for a period of time.[3] Thus Luke refers to the "period of his Ascension" and the "period of the Son of Man." The "period of the Son of Man" must refer to the time between the Ascension and the Parousia, leading up to the Parousia itself, i.e., the "day of the Son of Man" (17:22, 26; 17:24, 30; cf. Acts 7:56). Flender implies that the "period of his Ascension" (9:51) is also a reference to the time between the Ascension and Parousia.[4] Lk. 9:51, however, refers to the time of Jesus' activity which is immediately taken up and which ends at Acts 1.[5] The "days of his Ascension" are analogous to the "days of the Son of Man," refering to the period which leads to and finally culminates with the "day" in question. The themes had been raised in the Transfiguration story, then taken up in 9:51, and Jesus' "days of Ascension" are finally brought to culmination in the Ascension story in Acts 1. Acts 1, moreover, also points to, and prepares for , the "day" of Pentecost in 2:1ff. Acts 2:1ff., therefore, corresponds both to the opening of Jesus' ministry (3:23-4:30) and to the beginning of Jesus' "days of Ascension" (Lk. 9:51ff.), and takes up immediately when those "days of Ascension" are accomplished.

---

[1] C. H. Talbert, "An Anti-Gnostic Tendency in Lucan Christology," NTS, XIV (January, 1968), 269, cf. p. 264f.

[2] Eduard Lohse has shown this, in "Die Bedeutung des Pfingstberichtes im Rahmen des lukanischen Geschichtswerkes," EvTh, XIII, 9 (1953), 422-436; cf. his "Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte," EvTh, XIV, 6 (1954), 256-275.

[3] Flender, St. Luke, p. 95.

[4] Ibid., pp. 95, 96, n. 1.

[5] Cf. Talbert, "Anti-Gnostic Tendency," pp. 264-265; also see Cadbury and Lake, in Beginnings, IV, p. 16.

There is also a correspondence between the Ascension and the Parousia.[1] Luke thus presents the story of Jesus and the history of the church with analogous structures. Each begins with an act of the Spirit, each leads up to the decisive day of vindication. In each period there is a way to go and a mission to fulfill. The stories of Jesus and the church are presented as a continuous, connected movement toward a goal, but it is a course of history broken by decisive events.

The structure of the story in Luke's gospel and Acts appears to be based on a threefold view of the course of events as Heinrich von Baer, Hans Conzelmann, and others have argued.[2] This is represented in Luke-Acts by the Time of Preparation (1:5-3:22); the Time of Jesus (3:23-Acts 1:26); and the Time of the church (Acts 2:1-28:31). These are linked by the Holy Spirit and the coming of salvation as it moves from Israel to the Gentiles, which movement culminates at Acts 28:28 (cf. Lk. 24:47).

Further differentiations are also descernible within the career of Jesus, as well as within the record of the church's expansion "to the end of the earth." This point, however, has been made: within the larger context of Prophecy/Fulfillment, Luke has exactly structured his two-part work on a time-basis. His opus might be called "The Sequence of Diverse Eschatological Fulfillments."

C. Geography and Travel

Two further structural elements of Luke-Acts which relate to the theology of Luke are (1) the geographical associations which are given to the various characters and sections of the book, and (2) the general expression of movement from place to place which pervades the whole. Hence Luke-Acts is built not only on a temporal, but also on a spatial basis.

---

[1] Cf. Flender, St. Luke, p. 93f.

[2] von Baer, Heilige Geist; Conzelmann, Theology, p. 16.

Dupont has noticed that the general order of the story of Luke-Acts is given a geographical basis. Jesus' story moves about in Galilee, goes from Galilee to Jerusalem, and has a finale in Jerusalem. In Acts, 1:8 is indicative: the story moves from Jerusalem out to Samaria and to Antioch, then from Asia Minor to Rome. This geographical scheme is a reflection of Luke's theological orientation. Jerusalem is the Holy City where the prophecies must be fulfilled (2:38; 9:31; 13:33; 18:31; 19:11), and the movement in Acts is that of the mission from Israel to the Gentiles.[1] Similarly, W. C. Robinson, Jr. has well argued that Luke has conceived of his history of salvation as a Way which leads from Israel to the Gentiles. He, like Dupont, notes the correspondence between the beginning and the end of Luke-Acts in the use of Isa. 40:5.[2] It is clear that the history in Luke-Acts is one which begins in Israel and ends in Rome, in which Jerusalem is the focal topos.

Luke makes an historical treatment of his themes of the coming of the Christ and salvation, but also pursues them to a geographical goal (Acts 28:28; cf. 1:8). This is carried out formally in that the history in Luke-Acts is conceived as a Journey which begins with the pious of Israel and ends with the Gentiles of Rome. The story of Luke-Acts is at once of a movement in time and a movement in space. This is reflected in the presentations of the main characters and the various motifs of movement which are present throughout the work. John has a ministry to Israel (1:17, 80; 3:21; Acts 13:24) and is said to have fulfilled a "course" (dromos; Acts 13:25). Jesus' earlier ministry is described as a movement about Galilee and the synagogues of Judea to preach the Kingdom of God (4:14-15, 43-44; 24:6-7). Then Jerusalem becomes a goal of movement in his later ministry. After he

---

[1]Dupont, "Salut des Gentils," pp. 134-136.

[2]W. C. Robinson, Jr., Der Weg, pp. 39-43. Also, R. Morgenthaler, Geschichtsschreibung, pp. 159ff., describes Luke-Acts as built upon an alternation of Jerusalem scenes and travel reports.

predicts the passion (9:22; cf. 24:6-7) the "days of his Ascension" begin and he must go to Jerusalem where he accomplishes his "exodus" (9:31, 51). His ministry is characterized as one in which he "went about" doing good and healing (Acts 10:38; cf. Lk. 23:5; 24:19; Acts 2:22), but which was destined to "go" to a particular end (Lk. 9:31; 13:33; 22:22). The apostolic witnesses, too, had to be on the move, and had a map laid out for them in their commission (Lk. 24:47; Acts 1:8). Paul, like John, had a dromos to complete (Acts 20:24). His ministry was one of journeying, but also one which led him to particular goals (Acts 19:21; 20:22). Thus Luke tells of temporal and spatial movement together.

The geographical factor serves Lucan theology in a twofold way. The necessity of movement to Jerusalem, the center of Israel, reflects Luke's belief that it was there that the events of salvation must take place. There was the temple to which Jesus must go and enter and in which he must teach (Lk. 2:49; 19:45-46; Chs. 20-21); there it was that a prophet was destined to die (13:32-35), and where suffering and vindication must take place (9:31, 51; 24:26); there it was that the apostolic mission must begin (24:47; Acts 1:8). Secondly, the geographical factor calls attention to the Gentile mission itself. The thrust toward the Gentiles was already expressed at the beginning (2:30; 3;4-6; 4:16-30). The geographical programme of Acts 1:8 represents the outward spread of the apostolic mission toward the "end of the earth" as it developed stage by stage (cf. 24:47). Each geographical stage attained by the missionary church also represents a greater level of understanding of God's will for the Gentiles (cf. Acts 8:1-3; 10:44-11:18; 13:40-41, 46-48; 15:1-35; 28:25-28).[1]

Both the temporal and spatial shape of Luke-Acts (i.e., history written as a journey) are developments of his theology. His primary themes of the coming of Christ and salvation are given historical and geographical treatment. The geographical

---

[1]See Jacques Dupont, "Salut des Gentils," pp. 132ff.

movement from Israel to the Gentiles is specifically a movement of salvation (Lk. 2:31; 3:6; Acts 13:26, 47; 28:28) in fulfillment of prophecy.

While the chief theological category underlying Lucan theology is that of prophecy and fulfillment, the specific subject of Lucan history is salvation. It is thus proper to describe Luke-Acts as a history of eschatological salvation. This is the theme which forms an inclusion at the beginning and end (Lk. 3:6; Acts 28:28). We have seen that Lk. 3:4-6 forms a rationale for Luke's history. It is this theme which is the object of Israel's hope (1:69; 3:6). This salvation is strictly connected with the coming of the Christ, Jesus (1:69; 2:26). In the ministry of Jesus this is clear in 4:16-21 and 19:1-10, and in important passages in Acts (4:12; 13:26; 28:28). The themes of Christ and salvation are carefully grounded in Scripture. It would be right, therefore, to say that Luke tells the story of a "Movement." The church in Acts, in fact, is called a "Way" (9:2; 19:9, 23; 22:4; 24:14, 22). It is a story of the movement of salvation up to Paul's arrival in Rome, which represents "all flesh" (cf. Lk. 3:6) or the "end of the earth" (cf. Acts 1:8; 13:46-47).[1] Luke describes how the prophecies of Christ and salvation are fulfilled in a history of their geographical movement.

Beyond the fact that Luke has written a two-book work, Luke-Acts is also shaped by two other structural factors which reflect his theology of prophecy and fulfillment. The one is the temporally conditioned division of the history which shows the discontinuity of the times as the eschatological events take place in ongoing history. The other is the spatially conditioned relation of travel and geography which expresses an ever broadening scope in the continuous movement from goal to goal,--from Israel, through Jerusalem, to the end of the earth. Neither the end of time nor the end of the earth is actually reached in Luke-Acts. Both ends are goals. The church's eschatological mission continues.

---

[1]Dupont, "Salut des Gentils," p. 141.

Vielhauer has correctly said of Luke that "seine literarische Technik der Quellenbenutzung ist ein Spiegel seiner Theologie."[1] For that reason we will devote the next section to determining the structure of Luke-Acts in more detail. The aim is to determine the structure of the literary work of Luke that best reflects the thinking of Luke.

D. Total Structure

In addition to the structural indicators of Lucan theology noted in the three preceding sections Luke makes skillful use of climax, prefiguration, and "stage-setting". Luke-Acts thus has a dramatic structure which causes the total movement of the story to progress by stages, from goal to goal, turning point to turning point. It was noted above that 3:21-22 has a pivotal importance for the gospel as a climax to the first section, but also as stage-setting for what follows. This structural element is also to be noted at other points in Luke's work: (1) the various sections of the structure of the gospel and Acts move to a climax of a decisive character in some way interpretative and/or determinative of Jesus' person or mission, or the church's mission; (2) such interpretative themes are taken up and developed in the immediately following sections, so that conclusions and openings of sections are thematically related, that is, the end of one section sets the stage for the next. The gospel and Acts are linked in a similar way. Indications of structural breaks in the gospel and the structural elements of climax and theme setting are described in the following paragraphs.

In 3:21-22 Jesus is "anointed" by the Spirit (Isa. 61:1ff.; Lk. 4:16ff.) and designated as "Son." The theme of Sonship determines the "beginning" in 3:23-4:13, and "Spirit" determines the story of 4:14-30. The first section ended with a messianic climax. The Spirit comes and Jesus hears

---

[1]Vielhauer, "Benedictus," p. 272.

the voice that confirms he is Son of God. His ministry then begins (3:23) with his credentials (3:23-38), his encounter with, and removal of, Satan (4:1-13), the summary of the nature of his ministry (4:14-15), and the programmatic pericope on the nature of his ministry and its outcome (4:16-30). Lk. 3:21-22 is thus a pivotal passage. The material that precedes leads up to it and is climaxed by it. The material that follows depends on it and takes up from it.[1]

The same can be said for the break at Lk. 9:51. The whole verse is filled with Lucan terms.[2] The "Sonship" theme recurs in the climax of 9:18-50, but the themes of suffering and glory are introduced, as well as the "exodus, which he was about to accomplish in Jerusalem," and the "two men" (kai idou andres duo). The messianic character of 9:18-36 with the themes Luke has added (exodus, Jerusalem, glory, the two men) and his connection of the pericopes more closely together by his redaction[3] sets the stage for the Journey to Jerusalem. By emphasizing Jesus' aspect of glory and the discussion of his "exodus" in Jerusalem (9:30ff.) Luke makes the Transfiguration a prefiguration of Jesus' Resurrection and Ascension, a foretaste of his vindication.[4] This brings about the

---

[1] C. H. Talbert, "An Anti-Gnostic Tendency," p. 269, has recently noted the focal significance of the anointing of Jesus: "Birth narratives, genealogy, temptation narrative, and Nazareth episode in Luke all function as guides for Luke's readers about the meaning of Jesus' baptism."

[2] See J. H. Davies, "The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," Studia Evangelica, II, ed. F. L. Cross ("Texte und Untersuchungen 87"; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964), 164-169. Cf. Eduard Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte," EvTh, XIV, 6 (1954), 256-275. Lohse points out the similar phraseology in Acts 2:1. Other related passages are Lk. 1:80; Acts 1:1-2, 21-22.

[3] Cf. Conzelmann, Theology, p. 57, n. 2; Schubert, "Luke 24," p. 181; who point out that the Transfiguration is more closely linked by Luke to the preceding Confession, Prediction of Suffering, and Prediction of Glory.

[4] See J. G. Davies, "The Prefiguration of the Ascension in the Third Gospel," JTS, N.S. VI (October, 1955), 229-233.

fulfillment of Jesus' "days of Ascension" in 9:51, and he sets "his face to go to Jerusalem." The whole movement to Jerusalem is determined by the fact that he "must suffer and enter into glory" (13:32ff.; 24:26). The "two men" reappear at the Resurrection (24:4) and at the Ascension (Acts 1:10).

The real problem of the section beginning with 9:51 is its extent. A Journey, and its report, ends at its destination, and Luke gives clear indication that this is in his mind here. Jerusalem is the goal (9:31, 51). The Travel narrative ends at 19:46, not at 18:14/15 or at 19:27/28.[1] Luke's redaction indicates that he intends an Itinerary, and that it leads to Jerusalem. He constantly refers to Jesus' "going," "way" or "drawing near."[2] The climax of the Journey is the arrival. Luke includes the Entry story by using the same formal phrases he uses throughout the section (19:28, 29, 36, 37, 41, 45).[3] Another indication that Luke ends the Travel narrative at 19:46 is that this ending parallels the close of Ch. 13. In 13:31-35 are the following elements:

---

[1]For others who end the Travel narrative at 19:46, see: J. H. Davies, "Purpose of the Central Section," pp. 164-169; M. D. Goulder, "The Chiastic Structure of the Lucan Journey," Studia Evangelica, II, 195-202; Talbert, "Anti-Gnostic Tendency," p. 264, no 1; cf. Creed, St. Luke, at 19:48. For 18:14, see: C. F. Evans, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," Studies in the Gospels, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957), 37-54; cf. the Huck-Lietzmann Synopsis. For 19:27, see: Bo Reicke, "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," Studia Evangelica, ed. Kurt Aland et al (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959), 115-125; Robinson, Der Weg, p. 23; Conzelmann, Theology, p. 17; cf. Plummer, Commentary, p. xxxix; Manson, Luke, p. ix.

[2]See J. H. Davies, "Purpose of the Central Section," pp. 164-169; W. C. Robinson, Jr., "The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative," JBL, LXXIX (March, 1960), 20-31.

[3]The following passages are relevant besides 9:51, viz., 9:53; 13:22; 13:33; 17:11; 18:31; 19:11; 19:28; 19:41. In 19:28 Luke adapts the Marcan introduction to the Entry to make it like the preceding formal phrases, though he keeps the Marcan spelling of Jerusalem. J. H. Davies, "Purpose of the Central Section," pp. 164ff., adds the following indications of the Journey, viz., 9:56, 57; 10:38; 14:25; 18:35; 19:1, 29, 36, 37, 45.

1. Jesus' compulsion to go to Jerusalem, because prophets must die there;
2. Jesus' lament over Jerusalem;
3. the mention that her house is forsaken;
4. the statement that she will not see him until she says "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord."

Each of these elements recurs in 19:28-46:

1. Jesus arrives in Jerusalem (19:36-41);
2. he weeps over her (19:41-44);
3. he cleans the "forsaken house" (19:45-46);
4. the "whole multitude of the disciples" says "Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord" (19:37-38).

This correspondence is more likely to be by design than by accident.[1] What is indicated by this is a two stage division of the Travel narrative, the final climax of the whole corresponding to Jesus' prophetic word at the end of the first part.[2] This is the most fitting climax to this section. When Jesus arrives at his destination he pronounces judgment on her in word (19:41-44) and in deed (19:45-46). This climax is again messianic, and it again sets the stage for what follows.

The next section, the Temple ministry of Chs. 20-21, presupposes the Entry and Cleansing of 19:45-46. The summary in 19:47-48 takes up Jesus' teaching in the Temple which he just seized and the efforts of the authorities to destroy him. This is adapted from Mark and describes the following chapters. There is another similar summary in 21:37-38, so that this section is framed by these two summaries on Jesus' teaching in the Temple.[3]

---

[1]Cf. Goulder, "Chiastic Structure," p. 202.

[2]See Grundmann, Evangelium, for a division into three stages.

[3]There is no real "Jerusalem" ministry as such in Luke's gospel. Luke scratches Mark's references about Jesus' going to and from Jerusalem. The only word that Jesus has for Jerusalem in Luke is the word of judgment and lamentation (13:31-35; 19:41-44; 23:28-31). Jerusalem is the focal topos in Luke-Acts, yet she is not the recipient of Jesus' teaching. His teaching in Chs. 20-21 is always in the Temple and the hearers are "the people." Cf. Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 73ff.

Finally, the whole story of Jesus is brought to completion in Acts 1:1-11 with the culmination of Jesus' "days of Ascension."[1] By completing Jesus' story in the opening of his second book Luke links them together as a unity. Acts 1 refers back to both Luke 24[2] and Luke 9.[3] Again, the themes at the end of Jesus' story in Acts 1 set the stage for the next section beginning at Acts 2:1, with the promise of the Spirit (Lk. 24:49; Acts 1:8) and the command to witness (Lk. 24:48; Acts 1:8), the outline of the church's mission (Acts 1:8), and the completion of the number of apostolic witnesses (Acts 1:15-26). In this way Acts 1 becomes the bridge between the gospel story and Acts and makes them a unity.[4] It serves as the completion and recapitulation of Jesus' story and the link to the mission of the church. In Acts itself the story moves in successive stages from the mission to Israel to the

---

[1]I hold that Acts 1:1-11 is the only Ascension account in Luke-Acts. In this way Luke could draw the two books together with his focus on Jesus' achievement of glory. This was the point to which his life was destined (9:31, 51; 24:26), but was also the paradigm for the outcome for which the apostolic mission was directed (21:24; 21:27; Acts 1:11). The vindication of Jesus was the model for the vindication of the faithful. The question is difficult, and the following points must suffice here: (1) the final story of Luke 24 parallels the Emmaus story and would be more likely meant as a Resurrection account; (2) Lk. 24 understood as a witness to the Ascension does no justice to Lk. 9:18-36, 51; (3) Acts 1 does do justice to Lk. 9; (4) the prefigurement of Lk. 9 indicates that Luke thought of Lk. 24 and Acts 1 in close connection, but as separate events; (5) the textual difficulties of Lk. 24:50ff. are easily explained as arising from Acts. It seems to me, therefore, that Luke's only account of the Ascension is Acts 1:9ff. The conclusion of the story of Jesus thus becomes the introduction to the story of the church. Cf. Schubert, "Structure," pp. 168, n. 13 and 169; Conzelmann, Theology, p. 94.

[2]Acts 1:4/Lk. 24:47-49; Acts 1:8/Lk. 24:47-49; Acts 1:10/Lk. 24:4; Acts 1:12/Lk. 24:47. There are also numerous ties with other parts of Luke, e.g., 19:11; 21:27; 22:69.

[3]Acts 1:3, 6/Lk. 9:27; Acts 1:11/Lk. 9:26; Acts 1:10/Lk. 9:29, 30; Acts 1:11/Lk. 9:31. For more, see J. G. Davies, "Prefigurement," pp. 229-233.

[4]Cf. Conzelmann, Theology, p. 183, n. 3.

mission to the Gentiles.[1] Jerusalem becomes the focal point of the whole work, as the place to which Jesus is compelled to go to accomplish his exodus (9:31), and from which the church's mission begins (Acts 1:8).

In summary, following the shift to the time of messianic fulfillment, caused by the Spirit anointing at 3:22, the ministry of Jesus appears in three stages, marked by the withdrawal of Satan (cf. 4:13; 22:3), as Conzelmann argued, but Conzelmann's divisions were not accurate. The three sections in my view are 3:23-9:50; 9:51-19:46; 19:47-21:38. The whole time of Jesus, however, includes a fourth section (22:1-Acts 1:26), and the Travel narrative is itself divided into two parts, the end of one pointing forward to the end of the second (9:51-13:35; 14:1-19:46).

This structure is also reflected in the text of Luke-Acts in a series of schematic verses, which include Lk. 16:16; 23:5; Acts 1:1-2; 1:21-22; 10:37-39; 13:23-25. The details of these verses will not be presented here, but it would be a mistake to take any one of these passages alone as a key to the structure of Luke's work or theology, as did Conzelmann (16:16) and W. C. Robinson, Jr. (23:5).[2] But they do exhibit a consistent pattern which reflects the separation of John and Jesus and the course of Jesus' ministry in the structure proposed here.

1. John preaches a baptism of repentance and bears witness to the Stronger One who comes after him (Acts 10:37f.; 13:24; cf. Lk. 3:1-3, 15-18).

---

[1]The structure of Acts, however, is more difficult to pin down. Paul Schubert notes that "Luke, like many good and bad authors, gives us no clear clue to a detailed outline, only the clear narrative itself. Thus all detailed outlines of Acts are a posteriori undertakings"--in "The Final Cycle of Speeches in the Book of Acts," JBL, LXXXVII (March, 1968), 1-16. That which will be provided here is virtually the same as that of J. C. O'Neill, The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting (London: S.P.C.K., 1961), Ch. 2, except that I mark a division at 2:1 instead of at 1:9, for the reasons given above.

[2]Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 16, 20, 23, 25; W. C. Robinson, Jr., Der Weg, pp. 30ff.

2. Jesus appears and begins his ministry in Galilee (Lk. 23:5; Acts 10:37; 13:24; cf. Lk. 3:23; 4:14).
3. The beginning occurs "after" or "from" the baptism of John (Lk. 16:16; Acts 1:21-22; 10:37; 13:24; cf. Lk. 3:21-22, 23).
4. Jesus covers "all of Judea" (23:5; Acts 10:37ff.).
5. Jesus' activity takes him to Jerusalem and culminates at his Ascension (23:5; Acts 1:1-2, 21-22; cf. Lk. 9:31, 51).

Taking into consideration the structural factors surveyed above (two books, division of times, geography and travel, and dramatic climax) the structure of Luke-Acts may be outlined as follows:[1]

(1:1-4)	
I. 1:5-3:22.	THE TIME OF PROPHECY AND PREPARATION.
A. 1:5-2:52.	The Prophecy and Hope of Israel.
B. 3:1-20.	Forerunner Fulfillment and Preparation of Israel.
C. 3:21-22.[2]	Anointing of the Messiah.
II. 3:23-Acts 1:26.	THE TIME OF JESUS.
A. 3:23-21:38.	The Ministry of Jesus.
1. 3:23-9:50.	In Galilee, the other cities, Judea.
2. 9:51-19:46.	The Way to Jerusalem.
a. 9:51-13:35.	
b. 14:1-19:46.	
3. 19:47-21:38.	The Temple Ministry.
B. 22:1-24:52.	The Passion and Resurrection.
C. Acts 1:1-26.	The Ascension--Conclusion of the Story of Jesus.
III. Acts 1-28.	THE TIME OF THE CHURCH. (From Jerusalem to Rome).
A. 1:1-26.	Introduction to the Story of the Church--Commission (see 1:8).
B. 2:1-8:3.	The Rejection by Judaism. (Jerusalem, to the Martyrdom of Stephen and Persecution. See 2:36; 5:31; 7:52).

---

[1] I will not argue the details of the outline of Acts here. Underlying it are the programme of Acts 1:8, the new act of the Spirit beginning with Acts 2:1, and the theme of the Jewish rejection of Jesus and the Gentile mission which culminates at Acts 28:28 (cf. Lk. 24:47). The structural elements of climax and stage-setting also play a part in the development of Acts, e.g., the Martyrdom of Stephen (Ch. 7), the Cornelius episode (Ch. 10), and the Jerusalem Council (Ch. 15). On the Cornelius story, see Martin Dibelius' article, in Studies in the Acts of the Apostles, pp. 109ff. Cf. J. C. O'Neill, Theology of Acts, Ch. 2; Ernst Haenchen, "The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity," Studies in Luke-Acts, 258-278. Some key verses are presented in the outline here.

C. 8:4-15:35. The Foundation of the Gentile Mission. (See 11:18).
1. 8:4-9:31. Samaria, to the Conversion of Paul.
2. 9:32-11:18. Peter, to the Conversion of Cornelius.
3. 11:19-15:35. Antioch, to the Council at Jerusalem.
D. 15:36-28:31. The Mission of Paul. (see 28:28).
1. 15:36-19:20. Paul, Mission to Ephesus.
2. 19:21-28:31. Paul, through Jerusalem to Rome.

It will be noticed that the structure proposed here overlaps the division between two books. It was noted above that the end of the first book necessitated the continuation in Acts. It is necessary to distinguish between book structure and story structure. Luke capitalizes on both. The end of the first book at Lk. 24 is explained from precedent, first of all, in that it follows a form established by Mark. Secondly, from the standpoint of subject-matter, Lk. 24 is related to Acts as prophecy to fulfillment. While Lk. 24 fulfills the prophecy of messianic suffering and glory, it lays down the commission to fulfill the mission to the nations and promises the Spirit. Thus, Lk. 24 completes a book like other gospels, but lays the theological groundwork for a continuing story (24:44-49). This much Acts 1 recapitulates.

The story structure, however, is different. While one book ends at Lk. 24, the other begins at Acts 1. But the first story ends at Acts 1, while the other begins at Acts 2:1. Both structural divisions are literary and theological. Acts 1 serves as both conclusion to the story of Jesus and as introduction to the story of the church. It is the literary/theological bridge between the two eschatological missions. For while the mission of the church has its inception at Acts 2:1, its basis and program are stated in Acts 1. These are (1) the promise of the Spirit (1:5, 8), (2) the program of its mission (1:8), (3) the Ascension of Jesus (1:9-11), and (4) the completion of the apostolic number of witnesses (1:15-26). Hence the end of the one story is the basis for the beginning of the next, i.e., the mission of the church is grounded in the exaltation of Jesus and his parting commission. Acts 1 is the end to which Lk. 9:31, 51 point; it is the basis from which the apostolic mission begins. The function of Acts 1 can thus

be summed up by the words recapitulation, completion, and introduction.

This is the structural shape of Lucan theology. It reflects the time-factor in which history is shaped by eschatological fulfillments (3:21-22; Acts 2:1-21), as well as the geographical factor which shows the continuous movement of the story of salvation as it moves from Israel to the Gentiles, from turning point to turning point. Within the context of this history of fulfillment is the Lucan presentation of John the Baptist.

III. Traditional Materials and Specifically Lucan Texts on John

In the first chapter it was demonstrated that the Infancy stories are an integral part of the work of Luke and that the material they contain on John the Baptist must therefore be taken seriously in order to determine the role of John in Lucan theology. In the second chapter the basic category of Lucan theology, prophecy and fulfillment, and the shape of Luke's history of fulfillment were described in order to make clear the theological context for the study of Luke's view of John the Baptist.

Chapters III and IV will now deal specifically with the Lucan texts on John. In chapter III the texts themselves will be analyzed for their significance and use in the Lucan redaction. These texts will be treated in their relative order of occurrence, beginning with the Infancy stories, followed by the texts in the Lucan redaction of Mark and "Q", and finally concluding with the texts on John in Acts.

A. The Infancy Stories

The Infancy narratives are a complex combination of various literary forms such as narrative, poetry and song, and discourse. The focus of the meaning, however, is to be found in the sayings and songs of the characters. The narrative portions themselves serve as the framework and setting for the significant statements that are made. This was pointed out as a general principle for Luke-Acts by Minear: "Luke's thought gravitates toward and is oriented around strategic

speeches, citations, and hymns."[1] Dibelius said as much for the stories of John in the Infancy narratives: "Aus den Worten des Engels und aus dem auf den Täufer bezüglichen Abschnitten des Benedictus lässt sich die Meinung des Autors über die Täuferwirksamkeit entnehmen."[2] Taking the lead of Dibelius this section will deal with the content of the statements made about John in 1:15-17 and 1:76-77, as well as 1:80.

The principle stated above is certainly true in the narrative of Gabriel's appearance to Zechariah (1:5-25). The high point is the statement of Gabriel to Zechariah on the character and significance of the son to be born, 1:15-17. It consists of the following parts: a general statement of John's character and effect (1:15-16), and a specific statement of his task (1:17). Hence,

estai gar megas enôpion kyriou,
kai oinon kai sikera ou mê piê,
kai pneumatos hagiou plêsthêsetai eti ek koilias mâtros autou,
kai pollous tôn huiôn Israêl epistrepsei epi kyrion ton theon autôn
kai autos proeleusetai enôpion autou en pneumati kai dynamei Êliou,
epistrepsai kardias paterôn epi tekna
kai apeitheis en phronêsei dikaiôn,
hetoimasai kyriô laon kateskeuasmenon.

In the first line it is said that John "will be great before the Lord." This line, as is true of the whole statement, is written in the future tense, and serves a prophetic function. This is what the child will be. The line must be compared to the similar line in 1:32 where it is said that Jesus "shall be great." The particular phrase estai megas is used by Luke only in these two passages. The statement about Jesus' greatness also heads a passage on the child's character and significance. For each of them it is simply stated that the child is significant, and the lines which follow show why. In the case of 1:15-17, the first three lines which follow identify John with a definite type of

---

[1]Minear, "Birth Stories," p. 116.

[2]Dibelius, Johannes dem Täufer, p. 76.

activity, and then the second part, beginning with the emphatic kai autos, states his specific task.

The first statement in the first part is kai oinon kai sikera ou mê piê. The avoidance of "wine and strong drink" classes John with the Nazirites, or at least ascribes to him the custom they followed. Luke omits the ascetic description of John from the Marcan account of his ministry, but compare the differentiation between John and Jesus in 7:31ff. and between their disciples in 5:33ff. The phrase refers to the statement of the Naziritic requirement laid down in Num. 6:3 (cf. Dt. 29:5). In the context of a birth story, however, it also draws a comparison with heroes of old Israel, Samson and Samuel. Part of the Nazirite custom was to leave the hair uncut, which is not mentioned in 1:15. Some commentators have tried to make something of this; e.g., Vielhauer: "Da aber die andere Nasiräer-Sitte, das Haupthaar nicht zu scheren, fehlt, soll die Enthaltsamkeit von Wein vermutlich nur als Askese verstanden werden."[1] It may only reflect the lack of reference to haircutting in the passage from which it is taken (Judg. 13:4), though it occurs soon after in 13:5b and in I Sam. 1:11. In any case, what is cited is all that is necessary to associate John with the ancient men of God. John is consistently associated with the piety and custom of old Israel (cf. 7:28, 31ff.; 5:33ff.) and in Lk. 16:14-18 the saying of Jesus in 16:16 seems to be telling the Pharisees that their time was the time which John brought to an end. John's association with Israel will be dealt with in more detail in Ch. IV.

The second statement describing John's character is kai pneumatos hagiou plêsthêsetai eti ek koilias mêtros autou. John is like several others in that he is "filled with the Holy Spirit," and the result of such filling is the outburst of prophecy. The expression pneumatos hagiou plêsthêsetai is Lucan.[2] The verb pimplêmi is used twice in Matthew

---

[1]Vielhauer, "Benedictus," p. 259.

[2]Cf. Plummer, Commentary, p. 14.

(22:10; 27:48); then it occurs thirteen times in Luke, nine in Acts, and nowhere else in the New Testament. Eight of these are in Lk. 1-2. The primary object of the verb is the "Holy Spirit" (eight times). This filling with the Holy Spirit takes place before and after the ministry of Jesus, but not during. Those who are "filled" are John (1:15); Elizabeth (1:41); Zechariah (1:67); "they all", i.e., the followers of Jesus on Pentecost (Acts 2:4); Peter (Acts 4:8); "all", i.e., the friends of Peter and John (Acts 4:31); and Paul (Acts 9:17; 13:9). This filling with the Holy Spirit accompanies a conversion (Acts 9:17), but usually brings about a crucial word or statement (1:41, 67; Acts 2:4; 4:8, 31; 13:9).

In the Visitation story Elizabeth is "filled with the Holy Spirit" (1:41), and this causes her to pronounce a blessing on Mary and her child. Zechariah is "filled" and this causes him to prophesy (1:67) and announce the coming of salvation (1:68-79). As part of that prophecy John himself is called "prophet of the Most High." That is the last reference to "filling" in the Gospel. In each case the Spirit motivates a prophetic voice. There is, however, another such voice motivated by the Spirit. Simeon was awaiting the "consolation of Israel" and "the Holy Spirit was upon him" (2:25). The Holy Spirit had communicated to him that he would see the Messiah of the Lord (2:26), so he came into the Temple at the right time "in the Spirit" (2:27). He, too, was moved to utter a blessing (2:29-32), but also a prophecy of judgment (2:34-35).

The rest of the phrase, however, determines the peculiarity of John. He is distinguished from all others in that he is filled with the Spirit eti ek koilias mêtros autou. The syntax points to competing notions. The child is filled with the Spirit "from birth" and while "yet" (eti) in his mother's womb. The second notion is probably motivated and supported by Lk. 1:41, 44. In this way John is made comparable and yet superior to Jeremiah (Jer. 1:4-5). Like the prophets of old, --Jeremiah, Samson, and Samuel,--John has his task set for him

from the start. He is destined to be a prophet and the Spirit claims him for prophecy before anything else can claim him.[1]

The third statement tells of the effect which John will have, i.e., kai pollous tôn huiôn Israêl epistrepsei epi kyrion ton theon autôn. While John's prophetic character has been established in vs. 15, here a chief prophetic function is assigned to him, that of "turning" or "conversion" (cf. Jer. 3:7, 10, 14; 18:8; Ezek. 3:19; Dan. 9:13). This is an activity limited to "sons of Israel." A ministry to Israel is in fact John's task and is consistently presented as such by Luke (cf. 1:17; 1:77; 3:15, 18, 21; 7:29; Acts 13:24). Thus the two terms "prophecy" and "Israel" most accurately describe John's function and destiny as it is described in 1:15-16.

Finally, John's specific prophetic task is spelled out in 1:17. The whole of the verse is based on Mal. 3:22-23, the prophecy of an eschatological forerunner of God. The sentence is itself an independent formulation of the prophecy, and the term hetoimasai bears a closer relationship to Isa. 40:3, but the phrase Êliou . . . tekna is obviously drawn from Mal. 3:22-23. The key verbs determine the structure of the sentence. The broadest expression of John's task is given in proeleusetai, but this is specifically defined by the infinitives epistrepsai and hetoimasai. The forerunner's task, therefore, is fulfilled by the functions of "turning" and "preparation."

---

[1]It is difficult to be absolutely certain whether the phrase is to be understood as meaning "from birth" or as "still in the womb." The critics are divided. Plummer, for example, writes that "the expression does not imply that John was filled with the Spirit before he was born (ver. 41)" (Commentary, p. 41). On the other hand, Lagrange writes: "La pensée de Luc est que ce moment se réalisa à la visite de Marie (1,44)" (Évangile selon Saint Luc Paris: Librairie Victor Lécoffre, 1927 , p. 17); cf. Tatum, "Epoch of Israel," p. 186; Creed, St. Luke, p. 11. In either case, the general meaning of the phrase is clear,--that John the Baptist is destined for the task of prophecy.

In vs. 17a the prefix pro- is characteristic of Luke (cf. 1:76; Acts 13:24) as is the conjunction of "spirit and power" (cf. 1:35; 4:14; Acts 1:8). The forerunner prophecy of Mal. 3:22f. called for the return of Elijah. John is not specifically identified with Elijah in this formulation, however, but with his "spirit and power." John, rather, is like Elijah in what he is to do. While Luke avoids the identification he nevertheless takes pains to ascribe the function of Elijah to John, namely, that of forerunner. In vs. 17b the citation from Malachi differs from the LXX (epistrêpsai for apokatastêsai, and plural nouns). The Hebrew text has the plural form. Another variation is found in Sir. 48:10 which has epistrepsai, like Luke, but with singular nouns like the LXX. The relationship between texts is a knotty problem and will be reviewed in Ch. IV. Suffice it to point out here that epistrepsai is a favorite term for Luke elsewhere, especially in Acts, for conversion. In this context it defines the prophetic function of John expressed in 1:16. The turning of the "sons of Israel" is here two-fold: the reconciliation of fathers and sons, and the change of the disobedient to a right mind, that is, reconciliation of men and God.

In vs. 17c the verb hetoimasai recalls Isa. 40:3 so that the two prophecies are combined. John's primary task as forerunner is to get the people ready for God. The laos, like "Israel," is elsewhere also the object of John's ministry (1:77; 3:21; 7:29).

That the passage speaks of a forerunner of God is indicated by vs. 16 (kyrion ton theon). There is no reference to the Messiah, and only the total Lucan context makes this passage refer to the forerunner of the Messiah, i.e., of Jesus. The fact that the term kyrios is also used absolutely in these verses (1:15a, 17c) makes it possible to link them with the Kyrios Jesus. In 1:41-44, when "the babe" leaps in Elizabeth's womb he evokes her exclamation that the mother of her "Lord" had come to her. The two passages are linked by the womb motif and thus associate the forerunner of the Lord with Jesus.

A precise summary can be stated in the words of Benoit: "Le portrait de Jean Baptiste aux vv. 15-17 comporte trois points principaux: prophète, convertisseur, précurseur."[1]

Within the Benedictus verses 76-77 also state the character and task of John the Baptist, as follows:

kai su de, paidion, prophêtês hypsistou klêthêsê·
proporeusê gar enôpion kyriou
hetoimasai hodous autou,
tou dounai gnôsin sôtêrias tô laô autou
en aphesei hamartiôn autôn.

Lk. 1:76-77 has numerous similarities to 1:15-17. The first to be noted is that both the Malachi and Isaiah prophecies are alluded to, so that the two prophecies are combined in John (vs. 76b). John is being identified as forerunner/preparer. Another similarity is the characteristic addition of pro- to the verb, proporeusê. Thus Luke insists that John "goes beforehand before the Lord" (vs. 76b). Also like 1:17 is that the broad verb proporeusê is specifically defined by the following infinitives, hetoimasai and dounai. It is possible to see a progression of thought in the three verbs. As John "goes before" the Lord by "preparing", so he "prepares" by "giving knowledge of salvation." This last expression shows the nature of John's preparation of the way. The element of judgment is lacking in favor of preparation for salvation (cf. the attenuation of the judgment theme in 3:1ff.). Grundmann notes that "der Infinitiv dounai expliziert den Infinitiv hetoimasai, und Vergebung der Sünden gibt der Errettung ihre Eigenart."[2] The "forgiveness of sins" is an important Lucan theme, expecially in Acts, but also in the tradition about John which Luke takes up in 3:1-3. Here the forgiveness is the way to knowledge of salvation. Note that in the Lucan redaction of Mark the themes of forgiveness and salvation are again connected in John's ministry (3:3-6).

---

[1]Benoit, "L'Enfance," p. 180.

[2]Grundmann, Evangelium, p. 73; cf. Plummer, Commentary, p. 42.

Yet another similarity to 1:17 is the reference to tô laô in 1:77. This verse thus helps explicate how "the people" are "readied" (1:17). In the Benedictus the "knowledge of salvation" refers back to the reference in vs. 69 to the "horn of salvation" from the "house of David," i.e., the Messiah. If the forerunner is to make salvation known to the people, he is at the same time to make known the Messiah. The two belong together.

Here again the passage taken alone refers to the forerunner of God, not of the Messiah. The whole song has a messianic character. The title prophêtês hypsistou in 1:76 has a messianic force in Test. Levi 8:15. The song might possibly be a messianic song in which these two verses (76-77) are simply a continuation of the preceding verses. The Davidic Messiah of 1:68-75 would then be further identified in vss. 76-77 according to his prophetic function.[1] As a part of the Lucan context, however, vss. 76-77 must be read as an interjection into the song. kai su de, paidion refers back to the references to to paidion in the preceding story of John's birth (1:57, 66). Grundmann noted that it answers the question of 1:66a (ti ara to paidion touto estai?) and relates to the opening of Zechariah's mouth (1:64, 67). In this way a hymn independent in itself is connected to the narrative.[2] Thus while Zechariah sings of the keras sôtêrias in 1:68-75, in vss. 76-77 he tells how the paidion of 1:57, 66 is to give gnôsin sôtêrias. Elsewhere in the Infancy stories it is Jesus who is identified as being from the "house of David" (1:27, 32; 2:4, 11). Luke therefore has made vss. 76-77 a statement about the forerunner of the Lord Jesus, the Messiah.

The last reference to John in the Infancy stories is the summary in 1:80. The first part of the verse is comparable to 2:40. Each of the birth stories is thus closed

---

[1]See Leaney, Commentary, p. 24.

[2]Grundmann, Evangelium, p. 69.

off with a summarizing sentence. The phrase in 1:80, however, deals specifically with the character and destiny of John. That John ekrataiouto pneumati differentiates him from Jesus (contrast 2:40), but is consistent with the prophecy of Gabriel that he should be filled from the womb. The reference, thus, is to John's growth toward his prophetic destiny. John is claimed by the Spirit at birth and grows "by the Spirit" until his appointed day. The definitive action of the Spirit on Jesus takes place at his anointing (3:23).

John's prophetic destiny is set forth further in 1:80b. kai ên en tais erêmois heôs hêmeras anadeixeôs autou pros ton Israêl. Being "in the deserts" points the reader to the beginning of John's activity in 3:1-2. Lk. 3:1-2 thus describes "the day of his appearance." That whole phrase has its counterpart in each of the following two "times" in the Lucan structure. For Jesus, his destiny is refered to in the words of 9:51 (tas hêmeras tês analêmpseôs autou; for the church cf. Acts 2:1). Just as Jesus has a destined day which he must fulfill, so does John. That day is his appearance pros ton Israêl. Here again John's task is related to Israel, as in 1:16.

In summary, the key passages in the Infancy stories present John the Baptist as the person who will fulfill the prophecy of a forerunner in Mal. 3:1, 22-23. The function of Elijah, therefore, is assigned to John, but Luke avoids identification of John with Elijah just as he will do in his redactional use of Marcan and "Q" material. John acts as forerunner by preparing the people, and so fulfilling the prophecy of Isa. 40:3. His work of preparation is defined by his "giving knowledge of salvation", which is connected with the coming of the Davidic Messiah, and his summons of the sons of Israel to "conversion." John prepares "for the Lord," but the object of his preparation is "the people," namely, Israel. John is set apart for his prophetic task by the Holy Spirit and nurtured by the Spirit until his

appointed day comes. The Infancy stories identify John as the one who fulfills the eschatological prophecy of a forerunner, and restates the prophecy by pointing forward to John's day of appearance.

B. Marcan and "Q" Material: Omissions and Alterations

The materials which are used in Luke-Acts on John the Baptist can be categorized according to the sources (insofar as the sources are recognizable) from which Luke has taken them. The following three categories are most obvious: (1) material for Mark; (2) material from Matthew or "Q"; and (3) material used only by Luke. In comparison with Marcan and Matthean texts it is possible to discover how Luke has made additions, omissions or transpositions in the material, or where he differs from his sources. This approach, of course, is not possible for the passages peculiar to Luke. We will first summarize Luke's use of Mark. It will be apparent from the summary that Luke made original and conscious use of his sources.

All three categories are present in the Lucan version of the ministry of John (3:1-22), but Mark forms the basis on which this narrative is built. The Marcan material makes up Lk. 3:3b-4 (Mk.1:2a, 3, 4), 3:16b (Mk. 1:7), and 3:21-22 (Mk. 1:9-11). A number of elements of the Marcan narrative have been omitted: 1:1, the Marcan heading; 1:2b, the citation of Mal. 3:1; 1:5, the description of John's baptizing activity; 1:6, John's dress; 1:7, the words <u>opisô mou</u>. In the material he used Luke made changes and transpositions. As for transpositions: Mk. 1:4 is used before the quotation of Isa. 40:3 to describe the beginning of John's ministry and <u>en tê erêmô</u> is separated to be included with the statement about John's call; the reference to the <u>archê</u> in Mk. 1:1 has its counterpart in Lk. 3:23 at the head of the Genealogy. The whole character of Mk. 1:9-11 is changed in Lk. 3:21-22 in the following ways: Mk. 1:9a is dropped entirely, with its

reference to Jesus' coming from Galilee, and replaced by the statement that the "whole people" was baptized (Lk. 3:21a); for Mk. 1:9b the reference to Jesus' baptism is changed from the indicative mood to a genitive absolute clause and eis ton Iordanou hypo Ioannou replaced by the reference to Jesus' praying (Lk. 3:21b); Lk. 3:21b drops Mark's statement about coming up out of the water (Mk. 1:10); for the descent of the Spirit Luke adds the characteristic to hagion and the adjective sômatikô.[1] The Lucan story thus focuses on the descent of the Spirit and the voice from heaven and de-emphasizes the baptism of Jesus. This is indicated further by the fact that Luke has written 3:21-22 as a single sentence, contrary to Mk. 1:9-11 (cf. Mt. 3:13-17), so that 3:21 becomes an introductory clause for 3:22.

The next Marcan reference to John the Baptist is Mk. 2:18-19 in the context of the question about fasting. The disciples of John and the Pharisees both fast, but the disciples of Jesus do not. Luke's introductory line makes a smooth connection with the preceding story (5:33). He heightens the contrast with the addition of pykna (often) and "offering prayers," while Jesus' disciples "eat and drink." The change to "eat and drink" ties the story to the preceding, where it was said that Jesus "eats and drinks with the tax-collectors and sinners" (5:30). The disciples do as the master does. John and the Pharisees, with their disciples, engage in pious acts without the bridegroom. Jesus and his disciples eat and drink. The same type of contrast is drawn in "Q" (Lk. 7:33-34; Mt. 11:18-19) between the style of John and Jesus, and John's association is with the religious of Israel (cf. Lk. 16:16 with 16:14-15).

Luke also changes the Marcan report of Herod's opinion of Jesus (Mk. 6:14-16). In Mark, Herod entertained the rumors that Jesus was John raised from the dead, or Elijah, or a

---

[1] Note some minor agreements with Matthew against Mark here: aneôchthênai for schizomenous, ep' auton for eis auton. Cf. also vss. 16-17.

prophet of old. Herod concludes that "John, whom I beheaded, has been raised" (Mk. 6:16). In Luke, however, Herod rejects the possibility that Jesus is John the Baptist resurrected. "I beheaded John. Who is this about whom I hear these things?" (Lk. 9:9). One answer to the question of Jesus' identify is thus eliminated. The next Marcan passage concerns the same question (Mk. 8:27-33) and Jesus' true identity is made known in Peter's confession (Lk. 9:18-22). In Luke the two questionings are separated only by the Feeding of the Five Thousand (9:10-17).

The last Marcan text in which John figures is the Question about Jesus' Authority (Mk. 11:27-33; Lk. 20:1-8). Luke has here changed the whole Marcan context. He has done this by dropping the Cursing of the Fig Tree (Mk. 11:12-14), Jesus' return to Bethany (Mk. 11:11), and all reference to the place "Jerusalem" (cf. Mk. 11:15 and Lk. 19:45; Mk. 11:27a and Lk. 20:1a). Instead, the Cleansing of the Temple has been made the last incident of the Travel narrative (19:45-46), and the following ministry en tô hierô has been set apart by two inclusive summaries (19:47-48; 21:37-38). Thus, after Jesus has come to Jerusalem and entered the Temple, the Question of his authority becomes the opening issue of his ministry en tô hierô. Against Mk. 11:27a Luke adds that Jesus was "teaching the people" and "preaching the good news" (20:1). The actual dialogue about John, while somewhat re-worded (esp. vs. 6), is essentially the same. The change in the Marcan context raises the question whether Luke has the Malachi prophecy in mind, i.e., Mal. 3:1, that the Lord will come to his Temple (cf. Lk. 2:49). Then Lk. 20:1-8, at the head of the Temple ministry, and just after Jesus has entered the Temple, would have this effect: if one can accept the baptism of John the prophet, the question of Jesus' authority is already answered.

Luke has also omitted Marcan material on John the Baptist. This includes the account of his arrest and death (Mk. 6:17-29) and his identification with Elijah (Mk. 9:9-13).

Luke also made use of the so-called "Q" source for his treatment of John the Baptist, that is, material which he has in common with Matthew. In Lk. 3:1-22 the "Q" material consists of Lk. 3:3a (Mt. 3:5b); 3:7-9 (Mt. 3:7-10); and 3:17) (Mt. 3:12).[1] Luke has transposed Mt. 3:5b (pasa hê perichôros tou Iordanou), together with Mk. 1:4, to precede the citation from Isa. 40, in order to describe the beginning of John's ministry. In Lk. 3:7a, where Matthew makes specific reference to "Pharisees and Sadducees" (Mt. 3:7), Luke has the general ochlois. In the Lucan conception the "crowds" and the "people" are receptive to John (cf. 3:10, 21; 7:29), while the leaders of the people are not (7:30; cf. 20:1). In Lk. 3:8 the call for "worthy fruits" (pl.) differs from the singular of Mt. 3:9, but compare Acts 26:20 (axia tês metanoias erga). In 3:16 Luke follows the Marcan form erchetai de ho ischyroteros mou (Mk. 1:7) for the Matthean ho erchomenos ischyroteros (Mt. 3:11), but the latter title occurs in Lk. 7:19-20.

"Q" material on John the Baptist is also used by Luke in 7:18-23 (Mt. 11:2-6) and 7:24-35 (Mt. 11:7-19). There are a number of differences to be noted in Lk. 7:18-23. The introductory verse 18 differs from that of Matthew, but follows clearly from the Lucan context (7:1-10, 11-17), esp. vs. 17. Luke adds, vs. 18b, that John sent "two" disciples to question Jesus (a Lucan predilection). Verse 20a is in Luke only and makes a smooth transition from vs. 19. Verse 21 also is only in Luke. It is a recital of messianic acts of mercy (cf. Isa. 29:18-19; 35:5-6; 61:1-2) and sets the stage for the answer of vss. 22-23. The change in tense in 7:22 (ha eidete kai êkousate) is probably due to the recital of vs. 21.

There is little significant difference between Lk. 7:24-28 and Mt. 11:7-11. Both Luke and Matthew have Jesus' witness

---

[1] Note that Mark and "Q" overlap here, so that Lk. 3:16a and 3:16c must be compared to Mt. 3:11a and 3:11c.

that John was "more than a prophet,"--he was the fulfillment of Mal. 3:1, which is cited here. Luke has himatiois and endoxô kai truphê hyparchontes in vs. 25, which heightens the contrast between John and the kings (cf. Mt. 11:8). Contrary to Matthew, Luke has no reference to Elijah in this pericope. Mt. 11:14 may be a Matthean addition, in view of his positive addition to Mark in 17:13. At any rate, it is lacking in Luke just as the Marcan text on Elijah is lacking. The saying on the Law and the Prophets (Mt. 11:12-13) is used by Luke in another context in a more compact form and with the sequence reversed (Lk. 16:16). There is little difference between Mt. 11:16-19 and Lk. 7:31-35. The reference to ergôn in Mt. 11:19 reflects his statement in 11:2 and may represent Matthean redaction.

Another reference to John in Matthew is in Mt. 21:23 at the conclusion of his Parable of the Two Sons, which describes contrasting reactions to John. The Lucan counterpart to this is 7:29-30 where it shows the responses evoked by Jesus' witness to John as the fulfiller of Mal. 3:1.

It remains to note the additions which Luke himself has made in the context of the Marcan/"Q" description of the ministry of John, 3:1-22. These include 3:1-2 (the description of the historical context), 3:5-6 (the extension of the citation of Isa. 40:3 to Isa. 40:5), 3:10-14 (John's ethical teaching), 3:15-16a (the question whether John might be the Christ), 3:18 (John's preaching of Good News to the people), 3:19-20 (the imprisonment of John). Luke has thus considerably expanded the narrative of John's ministry, including a description of its beginning and its conclusion, so that the whole story is told at onee.

It should be obvious from this survey that Luke has used these materials with free and conscious purpose. In the following pages there is a more detailed analysis of the significance of his redaction of the materials on John in Chs. three and seven.

C. The Redaction of Chapters Three and Seven

1. The Significance of Luke's Additions in Chapter Three

The primary passages in which Luke shares material about John the Baptist with Mark and Matthew are Lk. 3:1-22 and 7:18-35. It was noted in the preceding analysis that Lk. 3:1-22 is made up of material which comes from Mark, "Q", and which is peculiar to Luke. The following table shows the synoptic form of the varying materials.

Mark	"Q"	Luke
		1-2
	3a	
3b-4		
		5-6
	7-9	
		10-14
		15-16a
16b		
	17	
		18
		19-20
21-22		

It is obvious from this synopsis that more than half of 3:1-22 has been contributed in the context by Luke himself, whether by editorial comment, preservation of tradition, or composition. An examination of his redaction shows that his contribution runs still deeper.

All of Lk. 3:1-2 is Lucan with the exception of the last three words en tê erêmô, which are drawn from Mk. 1:4. With these verses an historical point of reference is provided for John's activity (cf. 1:5; 2:1-2). Verse 2b (egeneto rêma theou epi Iôannên ton Zachariou huion) is an introductory formula like those in the LXX for a prophet (cf. esp. Jer. 1:1). This extended introductory sentence replaces the Marcan heading "beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ" (archê tou euaggeliou Iêsou Christou; Mk. 1:1). Instead of a reference to the "beginning" Luke provides an elaborate historical setting for John's appearance, including the situation in Rome (cf. 2:1-2) and the situation in Israel (cf. 1:5). While the framework of world history is the setting, the date is specific, the "fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberias Caesar."

John appears as the fulfillment of prophecy laid out in the Infancy stories and the Old Testament. This is the "day of his appearance to Israel" which Lk. 1:80 makes the reader expect. As the "son of Zechariah" (3:2) he fulfills the angel's prophecy in 1:15-17, which in turn promises the fulfillment of the Malachi forerunner prophecy (Mal. 3:1, 22-23). Luke thus pinpoints the time of the fulfillment of Israel's eschatological prophecy as the fifteenth year of Tiberias. But the Marcan reference to the "beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ" is missing, and replaced by reference to the "beginning" of Jesus at Lk. 3:23, i.e., at the head of the Genealogy, after the anointing. This changes the picture somewhat. The story of John's imprisonment is inserted before the anointing of Jesus and only at that point is Jesus refered to (3:21). The "beginning" is thus separated from the ministry of John the Baptist (cf. 23:5; Acts 1:21-22; 10:37; 13:24f.). Is this the "beginning of the Gospel?" In fact, John "preached Good News" to the people in Lk. 3:18, but this is in the context of proclamation of one who is yet to come (3:16-17). John's "Good News" is that "salvation" (3:6) and the Christ (3:15-17) are coming. Luke places the "beginning" of that story at 3:23. Hence Luke dates the time of fulfillment in the appearance of John to the fifteenth year of Tiberias, but places the "beginning" of messianic fulfillment at 3:23 after John's ministry is completed. John remains a prophet of Israel (cf. 1:80; Acts 13:24) who points forward to the fulfillment of Israel's hope.

Luke adds the words biblô logôn (vs. 4) in introducing the citation from Isaiah, similar to many formal references to Scripture elsewhere in Luke-Acts (cf. 4:17, 20; 20:42; Acts 1:20; 7:42). In vss. 5-6 Luke has extended Mark's citation of Isa. 40:3 to include Isa. 40:4-5. The citation thus ends with kai opsetai pasa sarx to sôtêrion tou theou. The reference to "all flesh" and "salvation" would have attracted Luke (cf. 1:47; 2:11; 2:30; 1:69, 71, 77; 19:9; Acts 13:46-47; 28:28). The quotation thus forms an inclusion with

Acts 28:28. The addition is a reflection of Luke's own interests, and John's ministry has added to it the promise of salvation.

Verses 10-14 are peculiar to Luke. Following the warning of wrath and call to repentance in vss. 7-9, three groups of people ask John the question ti poiêsômen. John's answers show his work as an ethical teacher. It is difficult to determine whether these verses are traditional or composed by Luke. The ethical elements may certainly be traditional, yet the possibility that Luke has made up their form in 3:10-14 is indicated by comparison with Acts 2:37f. There, following Peter's speech and indictment, the listeners ask the same question, ti poiêsômen. Peter's answer in Acts 2:38 asks for repentance and baptism for the forgiveness of sins. These elements, too, are related to John's teaching (3:3). There is a difference in Acts 2:37-38. There the question follows the conviction of guilt and is answered by the call to repentance, while the question in Lk. 3:10-14 seems to presuppose repentance. Nevertheless, the two passages and their contexts are made up of common elements. Luke, moreover, has added the proclamation of salvation (3:6) and explicit reference to the Christ (3:15ff.) to the preaching of John, both of which are elements of the speech of Peter which precedes Acts 2:37-38 (cf. 2:21, 36).

John's ethical teaching is inserted by Luke immediately following his call to "do fruits worthy of repentance" (3:8) and the threat of judgment. The question in 3:10-14 is thus "what (fruits) shall we do?" The plural form "fruits" is in contrast to the singular of Mt. 3:8, but agrees with Acts 26:20 (doing works worthy of repentance; cf. Lk. 6:43ff.; 8:15). It is evident, then, that Luke conceives of the teaching of John and of the Christian teachers as comparable. Both call for repentance, for baptism for the forgiveness of sins, and for works worthy of repentance, and both do so in the light of their proclamation of the Christ and salvation. The additional elements of Christian preaching

(the name of Jesus, and the gift of the Holy Spirit) in Acts 2:38 are not yet possible for John.

Together with the addition of an historical framework (3:1-2), the concept of salvation for all flesh (3:6), and proclamation of the Christ (3:15-18), Luke's addition of John's ethical teaching following the threat of judgment reflects Luke's view of the indefiniteness of the time of judgment (cf. 19:11ff.; 21:34-36; Acts 1:6-7; 3:20-21). There is still time for ethical response to repentance. Conzelmann is correct at this point when he writes that

> the threat of judgement is now independent of the time when judgement will take place, of whether it is near or far. John does not declare that judgement is near, but that the Messiah is near, . . . The fact that John proclaims the Messiah therefore does not, as Luke sees it, mean that he proclaims that the End is near.[1]

Even John's ministry deals with the problem of how the repentant person shall live in the world.

Verses 15-16a, provided by Luke, are a question of the expectant people (cf. 1:21) concerning John, "whether he might be the Messiah." This sets the stage for John's saying about the coming of the Stronger One (vs. 17). The saying in this way becomes a denial from John's own lips that he is the Messiah (cf. Jn. 1:20, 25). It is also made, in this way, into a clear messianic witness, that is, the Christ is the Stronger One who is coming.[2] That witness is then concluded by the addition of vs. 18, summarizing John's activity with "the people," i.e., he "preached the Good News" to them. The saying about the coming of the Stronger One is thus framed between the reference to the Messiah and preaching the Good News.[3] Hence Luke adds that John the Baptist is a proclaimer

---

[1]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 102.

[2]Cf. the agreement of vss. 15-16 with Acts 13:25. See Ulrich Wilckens, Missionsreden, pp. 102ff.

[3]Cf. Dibelius, Johannes dem Täufer, p. 53: "Im Ganzen macht die Darstellung des Lukas einen zwiespältigen Eindruck: Johannes scheint danach beides zu sein, Gerichts- und Heilsprediger."

of the "Gospel" of the "Christ," as well as of "salvation" (3:6), a significant shift in the Marcan/"Q" emphasis on John's preaching of judgment.

Immediately following this is Luke's addition of vss. 19-20, telling of John's imprisonment. The story of John's ministry is drawn immediately to a close once its content is described.[1] The first reference to Jesus by name (vs. 21) thus occurs only after John is out of the picture. It is at this point that Luke adds the statement that "the whole people" had been baptized (3:21). John's work, in other words, was not only ended, but completed (cf. Acts 13:25). It is once John has completed his task that Jesus enters the scene. In vss. 21-22 Luke adds the reference to Jesus' praying, a common motif in his Gospel, but which also occurs at high points in Jesus' ministry, as Conzelmann points out (also the Transfiguration, 9:28, and the Mount of Olives, 22:39ff.).[2]

To sum up, the added elements in 3:1-22 are the proclamation of salvation, the reference to the Christ, and the ethical teaching as response to repentance. The fact that John can point forward to the coming of the Christ and salvation becomes the basis for his preaching of a baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins. His preaching is thematically camparable to the preaching in Acts. John's message, therefore, is described by Luke as "preaching Good News." Rather than being a preacher of imminent judgment, John is an Evangelizer. John's ministry is a definitely dated fulfillment of Israel's prophecy, yet it is at the same time separated from the "beginning" of messianic fulfillment and the time of salvation to which he points. He himself represents the prophecy of Israel for messianic salvation.

---

[1]Cf. Schmidt, Geschichte Jesu, p. 27: "Lk will hier die Geschichte des Johannes zum Abschluss bringen, um nachher nicht mehr darauf zurückzukommen. --Mit 3,21 beginnt dann die eigentliche Geschichte Jesu in unmittelbarem Anschluss an die Täuferwirksamkeit."

[2]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 58.

2. The Significance of Luke's Omissions in Chapter Three

In vs. 3a Luke mentions John's activity in pasan tên perichôron tou Iordanou. The phrase is in agreement with Matthew against Mark (Mt. 3:5; Mk. 1:5), but placed at the beginning, before the Isaiah citation, as a description of the locality of his ministry. In using it Luke omits reference to Judaea and Jerusalem. Likewise, Mk. 1:5, to which the phrase is properly paralleled and which refers to John's baptizing activity, is also left out. The substance of John's teaching is given, but John's baptizing of anyone is never described.[1] Only John's preaching of a baptism of repentance is described (3:3). The same emphasis can be noted in Acts 10:37-38 (meta to baptisma ho ekêryxen Iôannês),[2] and Acts 13:24 (prokêryxantos . . . baptisma metanoias). The activity of baptizing is not denied, but is an effect of the preaching. That the "crowds" came out to be baptized by him (3:7a) is a redactional statement, as is the reference to the baptism of "the whole people" (3:21a) which shows that John's task was completed.

In 3:4ff., like Matthew, Luke omits the citation of Mal. 3:1 (Mk. 1:2). This stands partly as a correction (Malachi is not Isaiah), but is partly due to the later use of Mal. 3:1. This verse is still applied to John (7:27; Mt. 11:10). An omission within an addition is the lack of Isa. 40:5a in the citation (3:4-6). This is perhaps due to the fact that the doxa kyriou has already been revealed in Luke (2:9), so that the future reference is now inappropriate. At any rate the citation as a whole is composed in the future tense and still has a future reference in its new Lucan context.

---

[1]Similarly, there is no reference to baptism in the Infancy narratives, and the titles "Baptist" and "Baptizer" are not used in any of the first three chapters. "Baptist", however, occurs twice in Lk. 7. Cf. Mt. 3:1; Mk. 1:4.

[2]So Wilckens, Missionsreden, pp. 101-102: "Die etwas' veränderte Formulierung in Act 10:37 zeigt, dass Lukas auf das kêryssein des Täufers besonderen Wert legt." "So ist alles, was Lukas über Johannes berichtet, eine Darstellung seiner Verkündigung."

The phônê boôntos en tê erêmô, of course, refers to John the Baptist (3:2; 1:80; 7:24) whose ministry is just beginning according to the text. The preparation of the way of the Lord describes the task laid out for him from birth (1:17, 76), and the fulfillment of that task is explained in the following verses (in the call for repentance, the fruits of repentance and ethical teaching, the witness to the coming of the Christ, and baptism of "the whole people"). The prophecy that "all flesh shall see the salvation of God" points us to the Gentile mission and the coming of the Christ, which are yet in the future. The re-assertion of the prophecy here makes known that these things are about to be fulfilled.

Luke also leaves out the reference to John's dress and diet in Mk. 1:6. This reference is often taken as a point of comparison with Elijah and its omission is then in keeping with Luke's omission of Marcan and Matthean passages which identify John with Elijah. Just as important, however, is that with this verse lacking, and with the reference to the activity of baptizing also taken out, the Isaiah quotation is immediately followed by John's preaching and teaching on which emphasis is thereby placed.

In vs. 16 the words opisô mou are omitted from Mk. 1:7.[1] This omission, together with the addition of 3:15, may show an apologetic interest, viz., John is not Messiah nor is Jesus his follower. John's message, rather, points to Jesus, who is the Messiah. At the same time, Luke shares "Q" material with Matthew here (or uses Matthew as the case may be), but fails to share Matthew's ho erchomenos. This expression is used later (7:18ff.) and will be treated when discussing its context.

It was noted above how Luke's redaction in 3:21-22 changed Mk. 1:9-11 so that it is no longer a baptism story. Rather, with "by John" and "coming up out of the water" deleted, and with Jesus' baptism mentioned in an incidental genitive

---

[1] In Acts 13:25; 19:4 the reference to one who comes "after me" is included, but with different words (met' eme).

absolute, all the stress is placed on the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus and on the voice from heaven.[1] John is no longer a character in the story. Luke is thus emphasizing the meaning of the Spirit and the voice. The story as Luke tells it is clearly interpreted by Luke in 4:16ff. in which Jesus quotes Isa. 61:1-2. This incident is the messianic anointing of Jesus in fulfillment of that prophecy and the Messiah whom John proclaimed "begins" (3:23). This is confirmed by the voice from heaven and the fulfillment of Lk. 1:35 is begun (klēthēsetai huios theou). The story is thus a pivotal point in the Lucan history of prophecy and fulfillment. John the Baptist is separated from the incident in that his name is dropped and the story of his imprisonment is told first. Moreover, it is said that the "whole people" were baptized (vs. 21). This may be further indicated by the omission of the reference to "Galilee" (Mk. 1:9). This topos appears only when Jesus' actual ministry begins (4:14; cf. 23:5; Acts 10;37). The time of messianic fulfillment begins with this incident, but only after John has completed preparation of the people (Israel)(cf. 1:16a, 17b; Acts 10:37; 13:24-25a).

In summary, Luke's omissions take attention away from John's personal appearance and activity and turns it to his work as a preacher and teacher. The Lucan additions noted above developed the content of his teaching. John is described more as a preacher than as a baptizer. The baptism of John is not denied, since the crowds accepted it and the whole people was baptized. Baptism remains a sign of repentance, and, in 3:21, is a sign that John's task was completed and preparation done. The statement of 3:21a, coming after the account of John's imprisonment, is thus the signal for Jesus' anointing. The story of Jesus' baptism is transformed to focus entirely on the descent of the Spirit after the baptizing is completed. Understood in the light of 4:16ff.

---

[1]Cf. Lagrange, Saint Luc, p. 115; Leaney, Commentary, p. 109; Creed, St. Luke, p. 57.

this event is the fulfillment of Isa. 61:1-2, that is, it is the Anointing of the Messiah. It is at this point that Luke turns to Jesus' "beginning" (3:23).

3. The Significance of Luke's Changes in Chapter Three

In Luke, the word of God came to John en tê erêmô (vs. 2), and then he went eis pasan tên perichôron tou Iordanou where he preached (vs. 3). In Mk. 1:4-5; Mt. 3:1, 5-6 this distinction between the two locales is not made. Moreover, in Mt. 3:5 (cf. Mk. 1:5) the phrase pasa hê perichôros tou Iordanou refers to the source from which people come to John for baptism, while in Luke John's activity is in the perichôros tou Iordanou. It was noted above that Conzelmann based his geographical theory on this distinction. The theory of Conzelmann is weakened, however, by the references to the "desert" in 1:80; 3:4 and 7:24. Lk. 1:80 is redactional (cf. 9:51). There is no evidence, therefore, that Luke intended to press the distinction. Taken together the two geographical notes describe the situation of John's call and the beginning of his ministry.

Luke has transposed the story of John's imprisonment (vss. 19-20) from Mk. 6:17-18, and hence removes John from the picture prior to Jesus' reception of the Spirit (vss. 21-22) and his "beginning" (3:23). Their ministries thus do not overlap at all in Luke's presentation; rather, John is temporally prior to Jesus. The picture given in the Acts speeches reflects this presentation.[1] There remains the question whether the saying of the voice from heaven (vs. 22) is the same as that in Mark, or if it is adopted directly

---

[1]Acts 10:37; 13:24-25; cf. Acts 1:21-22; Lk. 16:16. Cf. the remark on vss. 18-20 by Burton Scott Easton, The Gospel according to St. Luke (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926), 42: "The whole little section is probably a free composition of Lk's . . . ." Also Lagrange, Saint Luc, p. 113: "Propre à Luc qui termine ici ce qui regarde la prédication de Jean, car son arrestation par Hérode en fut la conséquence. Le baptême de Jésus appartient moins à l'histoire de Jean qu'à celle de Jésus. Cette terminaison ressemble à celle de I,80."

from Ps. 2:7. The latter has been accepted by numerous commentators.[1] The textual evidence, on the other hand, favors the Marcan form. Moreover, if the Infancy narratives are to be taken seriously as an integral part of Luke-Acts, the saying from Ps. 2:7 is contradictory. Not only has Jesus already been "begotten" as Son of God (1:32-35), but he has also already been appointed to, and been aware of, his destiny as Son of God (2:47-49). But that Jesus is called "Son" in this pivotal passage is the first instance of fulfillment of 1:35 and thus a sign that messianic fulfillment is taking place.

On the basis of this study of Luke's redaction in 3:1-22 the following conclusions may be stated. Luke describes John above all as a preacher and teacher. His preaching, however, includes not only the traditional "baptism of repentance for forgiveness of sins" (3:3) and "imminent wrath" (3:7), but also the "good news" (3:18). This additional factor is defined by the new elements of salvation for all flesh (3:6) and specific reference to "the Christ" (3:15). John's call for repentance and baptism, therefore, has a larger basis than the threat of judgment--its basis is now the message of Christ and salvation. John's work, moreover, is the signal for messianic fulfillment to begin. He himself is kept separate from and prior to the beginning. He does his work in his time (1:80; 3:1-2) and is imprisoned. Nevertheless, the "crowds" come for baptism and it is once the whole people is baptized that the messianic Anointing occurs. This is the sequence described in Acts 10:37-38; 13:24-25. The fulfillment of the messianic prophecies, therefore, follows John and begins with 3:21-22. John represents Israel as proclaimer of her hope and preparer for its fulfillment. He himself, however, begins fulfillment as forerunner and preparer in the fifteenth year of Tiberias.

---

[1]Leaney, Commentary, p. 111; Grundmann, Evangelium, p. 108; Dibelius, Johannes dem Täufer, p. 60; Flender, St. Luke, p. 136, n. 6. For the Marcan form, see Easton, St. Luke, p. 42; Creed, St. Luke, p. 581

4. The Lucan Redaction of Chapter Seven

The other primary section involving John is 7:18-35, which is "Q" material. Two closely tied pericopes are involved, in which John puts a question to Jesus, and Jesus talks about John. The following points arise from an examination of Luke's use of these pericopes compared to Matthew's, and of their relation to 3:1-22. The first is 7:18-23.

In vs. 18, duo specifies the number of disciples sent to ask the question of Jesus. This is a part of a general tendency in Luke, belonging to his theology of witness.[1] Thus in what follows there is a legitimate witness. In vs. 20 is the actual questioning by the men. Verse 21 recites healings "in that hour" in the presence of these two witnesses.[2] This precedes Jesus' actual answer to the question. This answer itself is made in terms of messianic prophecies in Isa. 29:18-19; 35:5-6; 61:1-2 (cf. Lk. 4:16ff.). Thus, messianic acts are performed in the presence of the two men. The healing, exorcism, and restoration of sight here mentioned should be seen together with the preceding Centurion's Servant and Widow's Son at Nain, since John's immediate reason for sending the two men was due to reports about these incidents (see vss. 17, 18). Verse 18a introduces the pericope differently than Matthew. Matthew's references to John being in prison and to "the works of the Christ" fit his own context and interest and are unnecessary in Luke. Luke's own reference to the report to John follows from vs. 17.

This pericope is less about John than about the recognition of Jesus' messianic status. But John has the part of first putting the question, through two witnesses, evoking the answer of Jesus in vss. 22-23. Jesus says neither "yes" nor "no", but allows the witnesses to draw their own conclusions. Previously, the report went out that a "prophet was present" and that "God had visited his people" (7:17). It is

---

[1] Cf. the specification of "two men" at 9:30; 24:4; Acts 1:10; also Lk. 24:13; cf. Rev. 11:3ff.

[2] See John F. Craghan, "A Redactional Study of Lk 7,21 in the Light of Dt 19,15," CBQ, XXIX (July, 1967), 47-61.

for John to probe at the real nature of that visitation. This is related to his work as witness to the coming of the Messiah in 3:15-18. There the messianic expectancy was related to John himself (3:15), but he diverted it to the Stronger One who is coming (3:16-17). Now he poses the question to Jesus directly: Are you the one who is coming or shall we expect another?

This is entirely consistent with his function in Ch. 3. In Luke's presentation there is no element of doubt in John's mind implied at all. In Ch. 3 John is never related directly to Jesus, nor are any of his teachings. Jesus is mentioned by name only after John's imprisonment, no meeting between the two is mentioned, and Jesus' baptism is mentioned incidentally as one among many. Rather, in Luke's presentation, John proclaims that the Messiah is coming. Then, after his imprisonment, Jesus begins his ministry. It is Jesus who happens to be the Messiah. John recognizes the character of his ministry and thus is first to pose the question and bring it into the open.[1] In Ch. 3 John prepares the way for a Messiah unknown to him.[2] It is only in Ch. 7 that John himself relates his messianic preclamation specifically to Jesus.

The interpretation of John's question by Jacques Dupont may be considered at this point.[3] Dupont seeks to discover the explicit sense of the phrase "he who is coming," and asks whether it reflects a particular messianic conception. On the basis of his examination of messianic prophecies (Dan. 7:14;

---

[1]Leaney does not relate John's question to the messianic hope but to the hope for the return of Elijah (St. Luke, p. 114). Nevertheless, the expectancy with which John deals in Lk. 3:15 is for the Messiah, and in Luke's context John's question is prompted by the raising of a dead man among other things, which is part of the messianic hope. So for Luke "the Coming One" meant the Messiah. Cf. Joachim Jeremias, ThDNT, II, p. 936.

[2]Cf. Creed, St. Luke, p. 105.

[3]Jacques Dupont, "L'ambassade de Jean-Baptiste (Matthieu 11,2-6; Luc 7,18-23)," Nouvelle Revue Theologique, LXXXIII (Sept./Oct., 1961), 805-821; (November, 1961), 943-959.

Zech. 14:5; 9:9; Ps. 118:26; Gen. 49:10f.; Hab. 2:3; Deut. 18:15, 18) he concludes that the expression "Coming One" has to do with the eschatological Davidic king in his function as supreme judge.[1] In the gospels, John is presented as one who proclaims the "Stronger One" who "comes after me." This one who is to come is a sovereign Judge, who brings the wrath of God and terrible judgment by fire. Dupont argues, therefore, that John's question "Are you he who is coming?" means "Are you the coming Judge?"[2] Dupont understands Jesus' beatitude (Mt. 11:6; Lk. 7:23) "And blessed is he who is not offended in me" to be directed to John's asking of the question. John is asking about the messianic quality of Jesus. He had preached the coming of judgment, but sees in Jesus another quality. In response to the question Jesus presents himself as a servant type according to Isa. 61:1-2; 35:5-6; 29:18-19, and in the beatitude invites John not to be offended.[3]

Dupont's study is directed to the sense of the tradition as a whole, and is not geared to the redaction of the Evangelists. Luke's intention seems to be slightly divergent from that of the tradition as Dupont understands it. In Lk. 3 the emphasis on judgment in John's message is already attenuated. The extension of the Isa. 40 quotation to 40:5 (Lk. 3:6) places the stress on the theme of salvation. With the lack of Mk. 1:5-6 John's message of repentance (3:7-9) is immediately related to this message of salvation. The coming of judgment is also put off by the addition of John's ethical teaching in 3:10-14. Moreover, in 3:15-18, where John's proclamation of "one who comes" is directly related to the coming of the Christ (3:15f.), John's message is characterized as "preaching Good News to the people." John's ministry in Luke, thus, is presented more as the proclamation of the coming of salvation with the Christ than of the eschatological judge.[4]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 814ff. [2] Ibid., p. 821.

[3] Ibid., pp. 943ff., 959.

[4] Cf. Georg Richter, "'Bist du Elias?' (Joh 1,21)," BZ, VI (July, 1962), 246, 251.

John's conception of the Messiah according to Luke was characterized by the prophecy of Isaiah.

In Lk. 7:18-23, then, John's question arises, not because he sees in Jesus a quality other than that which he proclaimed, but because he sees the work of salvation taking place. Lk. 7:18, as already noted, shows John's question to be aroused because of Jesus' preceding miracles. This must be understood in relation to the fact that in Lk. 3 John and Jesus have no direct personal encounter. John did not know who the Messiah would be. This means that his question arises, not from doubts about Jesus, but recognition that Jesus' ministry reflects the messianic activity he looked for, that is, that drawn from the prophecy of Isaiah. Jesus' demonstration in 7:21-22 according to the Isaiah prophecies is a confirmation of John's recognition before two witnesses. The beatitude in 7:23 has a positive meaning in Luke. John is blessed because he is not offended, unlike Jesus' own hometown (which was also exposed to Isa. 61:1-2!).

Thus Luke keeps John and Jesus apart. John functions in his ministry as proclaimer of the Christ and salvation and preparer of Israel for fulfillment of the messianic hope. After his task is done and the messianic prophecies begin their fulfillment (that is, the prophecies of Isaiah) it is John who first recognizes them (from hearsay) and poses the question about the Christ,--are you he? This witness of John to the fulfillment of messianic prophecies leads Jesus to bear witness to John.

In 7:24-35 Jesus speaks about John to the crowd. Verses 29-30 are not present in Mt. 11, but should be compared to Mt. 21:32, the conclusion of the Parable of the Two Sons.[1] These verses, however, were probably written up and put in this context by Luke himself to note reaction to Jesus' declaration of the greatness of John (vss. 24b-28). A number of elements are characteristic of Luke, e.g., the phrase pas

[1]The wording, however, is entirely different, and Matthew's line is direct address rather than a narrative comment.

ho laos,[1] the verb dikaioô,[2] and the phrase boulê tou theou.[3] Also the division between hê laos (vs. 29) and the leadership of Israel (vs. 30) is a Lucan emphasis. By this piece of redaction Luke has tied this pericope more closely to the ministry of John in 3:1-20. There he stated that "all the people" were baptized (3:21; cf. 3:7, where ochlois replaces Pharisees and Sadducees), and the tax-collectors came to be baptized by him (3:12). These, too, are redactional statements. This is a sign that Luke is consciously using this pericope, not only in this context, but as a part of his total conception of the place of John the Baptist. Jesus himself here affirms the character and significance of John's work in a passage from tradition, and Luke's redactional statement places that work within the Plan of God. The reactions of 7:29-30, therefore, are reactions to Jesus' assertion that the Malachi prophecy has been fulfilled by John.

Luke's form of the pericope continues directly to the saying about children in the marketplace (7:31-35), where Matthew includes the sayings about the Law and the Prophets and the identification of John with Elijah (11:12-15). The latter is lacking entirely in Luke. Mk. 9:9-13, which states that Elijah must come first, and that he has already come (where Matthew adds a line stating that this meant John the Baptist, 17:13), is also omitted by Luke. So Luke has no statement which positively says John=Elijah (1:17 is ambiguous). The citation of Mal. 3:1 in vs. 27 (Mt. 11:10) states not who John is, but what he does. The saying about the Law and the Prophets (Mt. 11:12-13) is used by Luke in another context (16:16) in condensed form and with the sequence reversed. It shows a sign of Luke's own rewriting in

---

[1]Cf. 2:10, 31; 3:21; 8:47; 9:13; 11:53; 18:43; 20:45; 21:38; 24:19; in Matthew, only 27:25.

[2]Seven times in Luke-Acts; two in Matthew.

[3]Only in Luke-Acts in the New Testament: 7:30; Acts 2:23; 13:36; 20:27. Moreover, the term boulê is used in Luke-Acts ten times, only three times elsewhere in the New Testament.

the use of the verb euaggelizesthai.[1] This was made a key verse for the interpretation of John in Luke, and of Lucan Heilsgeschichte, by Conzelmann.[2] The comparison here with the Matthean text leads to the problem of John's relation to Elijah in Luke and to the question of Luke's use of 16:16. We turn first to the Elijah problem.

5. John the Baptist and Elijah

Two related problems may be considered here. First, it was noted that the Lucan addition in 7:29-30 registers reactions to Jesus' application of Mal. 3:1 to John the Baptist. Luke thus affirms the Christian tradition that John fulfills this prophecy as forerunner of the Lord. Hans Conzelmann, however, has denied that Luke treats John as the forerunner. Second, Luke lacks the Matthean statement that identifies John with Elijah as well as Mk. 9:9-13. There has been a difference of opinion on whether Luke nevertheless makes an identification of John with Elijah, with the majority of recent scholars deciding in the negative.[3]

---

[1]For its use with the Kingdom of God as its object, cf. 4:43; 8:1; Acts 8:12.

[2]Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 20, 23, 25-26, passim.

[3]Among those who say John is identified with Elijah are Adolf Schlatter, Das Evangelium des Lukas (2te Aufl.; Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960), 548; Oliver, "Lucan Birth Stories," p. 218; J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus," Twelve New Testament Studies ("Studies in Biblical Theology 34"; London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1962), 46. Among those who say John is not identified with Elijah are Easton, St. Luke, p. 5; Creed, St. Luke, p. 11; Grundmann, Evangelium, p. 51; Leaney, Commentary, p. 144; Vielhauer, "Benedictus," p. 260; Benoit, "L'Enfance," p. 181; Lampe, "Holy Spirit," p. 176; cf. M.-E. Boismard, in Élie le prophète, Vol. I: Selon les écritures et les traditions chrétiennes ("Études carmelitaines"; Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1956), 120. Oliver believes the full weight of the identification was intended to rest on the pre-ministry period. Others deny that the nativity account makes positive identification of the two figures. Conzelmann understands 1:17 as an identification, like Oliver, but denies it any relevance for Luke's view. For the study of the Elijah tradition, see Joachim Jeremias' article in ThDNT, II. pp. 928-941 and the bibliography contained there; J. A. T. Robinson,

There are a number of references and allusions to Elijah in Luke. Lk. 1:17 is peculiar to Luke. John is here at least associated with Elijah if not identified with him. John's function is fulfillment of the Elijah hope. This is the closest connection made between John and Elijah by explicit reference in Luke. Lk. 4:25-26 are also peculiar material. Here the reference to Elijah and Elisha demonstrates the offence of Jesus against his countrymen. The emphasis is on their ministry to foreigners as analogous to that of Jesus. In 9:8 (=Mk. 6:14-16; Mt. 14:1-2) Herod wonders about the identity of Jesus, with John and Elijah named as possibilities. No identification is made, and John is eliminated as a possibility in vs. 9 (unlike Mk. 6:16). The same goes for 9:19 (=Mk. 8:28; Mt. 16:14). In 9:30, 33 (=Mk. 9:4, 5; Mt. 17:3, 4) are the reference to Moses and Elijah in the Transfiguration account. Here Luke adds the redundant description kai idou andres duo. This relates them to the two men who appear at Jesus' Resurrection and Ascension (24:4; Acts 1:10). Luke is probably developing the independent significance of Moses and Elijah as witnesses to the glorification of Jesus. In Jewish tradition both Moses and Elijah had participated in doxa and analêmpsis. There are no identifications made with either figure here. In 9:54 a textual variant on the citation of II Kings 1:10, 12 adds hôs kai Êleias epoiêsen. Here an act like that of Elijah is requested of Jesus, but he refuses to allow it.

There are also significant non-references to Elijah. Mt. 11:14, with vss. 12-13, is lacking in Luke's version of the same incident. This verse identifies John with the Elijah who is to come. Given the "Q" hypothesis, it may be a Matthean formulation on the basis of 17:10-12. Mk. 9:11-13 (=Mt. 17:10-12) identifies John with Elijah by implication. Matthew adds 17:13 to make the identification positive. Luke

---

"Elijah, John and Jesus," pp. 28-52; G. Richter, "'Bist du Elias?' (Joh. 1,21)," BZ, VI (1962), 79-92, 238-256; VII (1963), 63-80; Élie le prophète, Vol. I.

omits the whole pericope. Here the function of Elijah expressed in Mal. 3:22-23 LXX (apokathistanei) is involved. This function is applied to Jesus in Acts 1:6, but he puts it off. Mk. 15:35-36 (=Mt. 27:47, 49), Jesus' cry of dereliction from the cross, is left out by Luke. Observers of the crucifixion thought Jesus was calling on Elijah.

Hans Conzelmann has not only pointed to the above mentioned non-references as showing Luke's refusal to identify John with Elijah, but has drawn the further conclusion that John is therefore not the forerunner in Luke. This is done, according to Conzelmann, in the interest of de-eschatologizing the ministry of John.[1] Luke's argument, in Conzelmann's view, is the reverse of his sources. John is not the precursor, because there is no precursor. John is the last of the prophets.[2] On Luke's redaction of 9:7-9 he writes: "Any thought of precursors and of the return of figures from the past is excluded."[3] Conzelmann sees a tension between the tradition and Luke's adaptation of it in Lk. 7:18-35. It agrees, he says, with 16:16. Verses 28-30 are Luke's interpretation, "although perhaps influenced by the sources."[4] Conzelmann's point is that John, in the tradition, was more than a prophet (7:26f.), but in Luke he becomes the greatest prophet. But Conzelmann misinterprets the addition of 7:29-30 when he understands it to negate the forerunner concept of vss. 26-27. The addition does not negate what precedes. We have already noted that 7:29-30 are a response to the preceding verses, including the citation of Mal. 3:1, and tie them to Luke's redaction in Ch. 3. Luke is making full use of the forerunner prophecy as it was traditionally related to John. Conzelmann also misinterprets the redaction of 9:7-9. It is

---

[1]Whether Luke's interest or Conzelmann's is an issue of debate; see the critique of W. C. Robinson, Jr., Der Weg des Herrn. Robinson, however, counters with the view that Luke's redaction of the John material is in the interest of anti-Baptist polemic, which is also debatable.

[2]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 25.

[3]Ibid., p. 51. [4]Ibid., p. 25.

true that figures from the past are excluded from possibility of identification with Jesus, but the "thought of precursors" is not even in question here. Even if John cannot be Elijah redivivus, according to this passage, Conzelmann takes an extra step in rejecting the forerunner concept. For though Luke does not say that John is Elijah, he applies to him Elijah's office of forerunning (1:17, 76; 7:27; Acts 13:24).

Conzelmann refuses to consider the views in 1:17 and 1:76. Luke's view of Moses and Elijah, he writes, "plainly contradicts the prologue," which links John with Elijah.[1] They are not precursors of the Parousia. In their appearance in the Transfiguration the role of both is completed (9:28-36); they are messengers to Jesus who come only to him.[2] Conzelmann presupposes that Lk. 1:17 and 1:76 identify John with Elijah redivivus. In that case they are in tension with Luke's omission of identifying passages and with the independent role of Moses and Elijah as witnesses to Jesus' "exodus" (9:31; 24:4; Acts 1:10).[3] John is not, however, identified in Ch. 1 as Elijah redivivus, but with his office. Luke's emphasis falls on the function which John must perform. Moreover, the failure to deal with Lk. 1-2 defeats Conzelmann's purpose of dealing with Luke's redaction of his sources, since Luke worked as fully on them as on Mark (and Acts). But Conzelmann failed to see that Mark's story of John's ministry was itself tied to the Infancy narratives by Luke.

Conzelmann notes a deliberate elimination of any significance attached to the figure of Elijah, and Moses appears as a prophet only as a part of tradition. "Moses and Elijah are treated by Luke in the same way as John the Baptist, whose message remains valid but who, as a person, belongs

---

[1] Ibid., p. 24.

[2] Ibid., p. 25.

[3] Contrary to Conzelmann, their role does not end with the Transfiguration, but with the Ascension to which the Transfiguration points.

entirely to the past epoch of redemptive history."[1] Conzelmann claims that Luke uses the Elijah tradition only to reject it. There is no forerunner either before the coming of Jesus or before the Parousia. John "has no essentially higher status than the other prophets."[2] The tradition, of course, says that John is more than a prophet and we have already seen that Luke maintains that view. Luke keeps the Elijah-tradition, but avoids an outright identification of John with Elijah. This may be because of the independent development of Moses and Elijah as witnesses to Jesus. John still performs the forerunner function.

Conzelmann was led by his view that Luke de-eschatologized these stories in the interest of Heilsgeschichte. Luke has schematized the traditional eschatological events into a series of events in history which take place according to plan. In this way eschatology is historicized. It would be better to say that the eschatological events have shaped the course of history. But they do not lose their character as decisive events. The fulfillment of the forerunner prophecy in John, the anointing of Jesus by the Spirit according to Isa. 61:1ff., and the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost according to the prophecy of Joel, are still decisive events of God, even though belonging to the course of history. Conzelmann's reasoning is that since Luke attempts to adapt the traditional eschatology, and since the forerunner concept is eschatological, then John could not be a forerunner in Luke. If Conzelmann were consistent he would have to conclude also that Jesus could not be a Messiah in Luke. But he cannot take this step, since Luke did not take it. Nor does Luke take the first step.

A. R. C. Leaney believes, like Conzelmann, that the association of John with Elijah in 1:17 and 1:76 is "in contrast to his usual treatment."[3] Leaney notes connections of

---

[1]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 167.

[2]Ibid., p. 167, also n. 1.

[3]Leaney, Commentary, p. 80; cf. pp. 41, 90, 224.

Luke's peculiar material with the stories of Moses and of Elijah and Elisha. He follows Harald Sahlin in suggesting the association of Jesus with Elijah (e.g., 4:25ff.; 7:11ff.; 9:51ff.; 9:61ff.) and thinks that this explains why Luke omits Mk. 9:9-13 where John is identified with Elijah.[1] Leaney also notes that Moses and Elijah re-appear as the "two men" at Resurrection and Ascension as well as at the Transfiguration.[2] There is, however, no identification of Jesus with Elijah in this material. Leaney summarizes "Q" in 7:18-35 by writing that

> John is doing no more than entertaining the possibility that Jesus is the Coming One (that is, he who was popularly identified with Elijah). Jesus invites John to go further and accept him as the Messiah, and identifies John before the people with the 'messenger' or Elijah.[3]

But this, according to Leaney, is inconsistent with Luke's own view in which Jesus himself is the fulfillment of the Elijah expectation.[4] Leaney is thus like Conzelmann in these two respects, in that he assumes the use of the Malachi tradition must mean identification of John with Elijah, and in that he fails to note that Luke's own redaction affirms the application of the Malachi prophecy to John. He adds further the argument that it was Jesus himself who fulfilled the Elijah expectation. Leaney, however, never shows this point, but only points to analogous associations of Jesus with stories

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 41-42; Harald Sahlin, Der Messias und das Gottesvolk. Studien zur protolukanischen Theologie (Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksells Boktryckeri AB, 1945), 81: "Vielmehr wird in Lk Jesus selbst mit Elia zusammengestellt, nicht nur Lk 9:8 und 19 (vgl. Mt 16:14; Mk 6:15; 8:28), sondern vor allem Lk 4:25f und 9:54 nach der längeren Lesart bei einer grossen Handschriftengruppe." Cf. also Lampe, "Holy Spirit," p. 176; Richter, "Bist du Elias?" pp. 253-254. Leaney notes other associations of Jesus with Moses and Elijah in 4:2; 10:4.

[2] Leaney, St. Luke, pp. 41f., 71, 167. This is a good observation and probably is to be understood as Moses and Elijah being witnesses to the most significant events in Jesus' story.

[3] Ibid., p. 144; cf. J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus," pp. 29ff.

[4] Leaney, Commentary, p. 144.

of Elijah's ministry (not the Elijah to come).[1] Elsewhere Leaney himself calls it a "close association" with Elijah.[2] A "close association" with Elijah is something that Jesus and John have in common. But they differ in their association. Jesus is related to Elijah's ministry, John is related to the Elijah hope. Neither, however, is Elijah, since Elijah, with Moses, has an independent role as a witness.[3]

Though Elijah and Moses are developed by Luke as witnesses to the glorification of Jesus, it may still be asked why Luke takes pains to eliminate identification of John with Elijah. On the one hand, Luke carefully preserves and develops John's role as the forerunner of the Lord, yet, on the other hand, he just as carefully removes the traditional indications that John is literally the Elijah who must first come (esp. Mk. 9:9-13par). This is done in spite of the fact that the forerunner was to be Elijah. The reason for removal of identification may be apologetic, that is, to guard against a tendency to give John an improper messianic status.

The four Evangelists as a whole reflect a tendency in this direction. In Mark there is an identification of John with Elijah by clear implication. In Mk. 1:6 the reference to John's dress and diet is often taken as a reference to Elijah.[4] Matthew makes Mark's clear implication explicit by

---

[1]Benoit's remark about Sahlin ("L'Enfance," p. 181, n. 5), also applies to Leaney, when he writes that Sahlin "exagère par ailleurs les relations établies par Luc entre Elie et Jésus lui-même."

[2]Leaney, Commentary, p. 174.

[3]Perhaps another indication that Luke makes no positive identification of John with Elijah is evident in that a late tradition said that it would be the returned Elijah who anoints the Messiah (Justin, Dial., 8,4; 49,1). This is certainly not true in Luke, where John's baptism of Jesus recedes into the background, and emphasis is given to anointing by the Spirit according to Isa. 61:1-2. The tradition, however, is late and may not have been known by Luke. Cf. Jeremias, ThDNT, II, p. 934; Boismard, in Élie le prophète, I, pp. 119, 122.

[4]One who disagrees is Carl Kraeling, John the Baptist, p. 14f.; cf. J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus," p. 29.

by his addition to Mark in 17:13. Similarly, in the "Q" pericope Mt. 11:7-19 the identification is explicitly made. In view of the addition in 17:13 this statement in Mt. 11:14 is likely a Matthean addition to "Q". But while Matthew actually says John=Elijah, Luke goes the other direction by removing all these identifying passages. The reference to John's dress is omitted, as is Mt. 11:14 and the entirety of Mk. 9:9-13. The imprisonment and death of John in Mk. 6:17-29 is replaced by the simple statement of Lk. 3:19-20. The reference in Lk. 1:17 says no more than that John is like Elijah (in spirit and power). The Evangelist John is a rough contemporary of Luke. In his gospel John the Baptist himself makes an absolute denial that he is Elijah (1:21, 25) at the same time that he denies that he is the Messiah (1:20, 25). Luke and John may reflect a similar situation in which the role and status of John must be carefully delineated over against a tendency to regard him as a messianic figure.[1]

The apologetic factor is certainly present in Luke's treatment of John. This surfaces in Luke's redaction of the Marcan tradition about the coming of the Stronger One. First, Luke adds 3:15 in which the people are said to be expectant and wonder whether John might be the Christ. This leads to John's response in 3:16 that the Stronger One is coming. It has already been noted that this redaction has a two-fold effect. On the one hand, it makes the reference to the Stronger One a clear witness to the coming of the Messiah. On the other hand, it also removes any possibility of messianic status for John himself. This comes from John's own lips as in Jn. 1:20, 25.

Second, Luke drops the phrase <u>opisô mou</u> in 3:16. The sense of the witness to the Stronger One remains clear without it, but its omission removes any thought that Jesus is a follower of John, since the term has the implication of discipleship.[2] Jesus follows John only in a temporal sense.

---

[1]See Richter, "Bist du Elias?" pp. 252ff.

[2]Cf. W. C. Robinson, Jr., <u>Der Weg</u>, p. 20.

Both of the above redactional techniques assure that Jesus remains the center of interest and importance, just as does the alternating parallelism of the Infancy narratives. At the same time John's status as forerunner is preserved, and he functions as a witness to Jesus. The same apologetic factor is evident in Acts 13:25 and 19:1ff. While Acts 19:1ff. states clearly how John functioned and to whom he bore witness, it also states that some people misunderstood him and needed to learn the proper response to his witness. John is a witness to Jesus, who came "after him" (met' eme), and it is he who must be followed. "Die Johannesjünger zur Zeit des Lukas scheinen von ihrem Meister ein anderes Bild gehabt zu haben, und Lukas benützt die Gelegenheit, um die notwendigen Korrekturen anzubringen."[1] In Acts 13:25, as in Lk. 3:15, 16, any messianic status John might receive is taken away. Here John himself denies such a status, as in John 1:20. John instead proclaims the one who comes after him (metà eme).

Luke thus is apparently conscious of a danger that a messianic status may be given to John is some quarters. Luke possibly takes pains to eliminate identification with Elijah because Elijah was thought of as a messianic figure,--"weil die Betrachtung des Täufers als Heilsgestalt, als des Messias, auf Grund seiner Gleichsetzung mit dem wiedergekehrten Elias erfolgt ist."[2] The hope for the forerunner expressed in Mal. 3 was also taken as the prophecy of a forerunner of God, not of the Messiah. The same is true of Sir. 48:10, so that in these passages Elijah may be thought of as a messianic figure.[3] This evident also in the material Luke uses in the Infancy narratives. Vielhauer argued that the Benedictus and Infancy narrative of John originally gave messianic status to John.[4]

---

[1]Richter, "Bist du Elias?" p. 253.

[2]Ibid., p. 253.

[3]See Jeremias, ThDNT, II, pp. 931, 937; J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus," p. 37f.

[4]Vielhauer, "Benedictus," pp. 260, 265ff.; cf. Grundmann, Evangelium, pp. 47ff.

In Luke's redaction of the Infancy narratives it becomes clear that Jesus is the Lord and that John is the preparer of his way.

Nevertheless, the apologetic factor in Luke's treatment of John is not the key to it. It is not Luke's purpose to show that John is subordinate to Jesus, but to show the role of John as preparer and forerunner. The apologetic guards against misinterpretation of John's status, but he nevertheless is great and a key person in the Plan of God, such as Peter and Paul are. While John is not Elijah, he is still the forerunner. It is John's function which is stressed. Going before Jesus is his destined "course" (Acts 13:24).

6. Lk. 16:16

The comparison of Lk. 7 with the Matthean text also leads to the question of Luke's use of the saying about the Law and the Prophets. While Matthew includes it in Jesus' witness to the Baptist (11:12-13) Luke has placed it in another context and schematized it. In 16:16 the sequence of the verse is the reverse of Mt. 11:12-13 and it is considerably briefer.

In Luke the saying is placed between criticism of the Pharisees and the saying about the validity of the Law. The validity of the Law in turn is followed by the example of the law on divorce. The saying in 16:16 tells of two times, one in which were the Law and the Prophets and one which follows, in which the Kingdom of God is proclaimed. The use of euaggelizesthai may indicate that this is a Lucan rewriting of the saying. Having already established the basic continuity of John with Jesus in terms of the fulfillment of eschatological prophecy, Luke is free to distinguish between the two. John heralds the Messiah, but Jesus inaugurates something new: the Reign of God. John is "pre-Reign," and thus is associated with the law and the prophets. The Pharisees in vss. 14-15 were also associated with the law and the prophets and represented religion and life according to the law and the prophets. The similarity of association of John

and the Pharisees with the law and the prophets is reflected in 5:33. The Pharisees, however, rejected the ministry of John (7:30). The effects of the saying in its context therefore may be this: in critizing the Pharisees Jesus informs them that their time is over and that it was brought to an end by John; now there is a new time, namely, the time in which the Kingdom of God is preached. Unlike the Pharisees, John prophetically points to "the time of Jesus." The old era is superceded.

Conzelmann made Lk. 16:16 the key to the understanding of Luke's separation of John and Jesus and for his own view of Lucan Heilsgeschichte.[1] The passage reads as follows: Ho nomos kai hoi prophêtai mechri Iôannou· apo tote hê basileia tou theou euaggelizetai kai pas eis autên biazetai. Some commentators are troubled, however, about using this passage as a basis for the separation of John and Jesus, as Conzelmann does.[2] By itself the passage is vague. Does mechri mean "up to" or "up to and including?" Does apo tote mean "since John" or "Beginning with John?" There needs to be more evidence to get the sense of the verse.[3] The other schematic verses in Luke-Acts provide more help. These passages have in common the mention of Jesus' "beginning," as in 3:23 (kai autos ên Iêsous archomenos hôsei etôn triakonta). Some also refer to his "end," so the the story of Jesus is bounded by an eisodos and an exodos.

---

[1]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 23. It is questionable, however, whether such an attenuated passage should be used as a key to the interpretation of Luke-Acts.

[2]E.g., W. C. Robinson, Jr., Der Weg, pp. 9-16; Wilckens, Missionsreden, p. 105, n. 2.

[3]Conzelmann, of course, backs up his conclusions with his arguments on Luke's redaction of Mark's narrative about John; for example, the note on John's imprisonment before the Baptism and Jesus' "beginning" after it, as well as the fact that John does not preach the Kingdom of God. See Theology, pp. 20-22; "Zur Lukasanalyze," ZThK, XLIX, 1 (1952), 18ff.

Luke 23:5 (didaskôn kath' holês tês Ioudaias, kai arxamenos apo tês Galilaios heôs hôde) is taken as a key verse by W. C. Robinson, Jr.[1] The passage indicates that Jesus' activity covered all of Jewish territory,[2] that it originated in Galilee, and ended in Jerusalem (cf. 4:14, 43-44; Acts 1:1-10). arxamenos recalls 3:23.

In Acts 1:1 it is explained that the prôton logon had to do with all which êrxato ho Iêsous poiein te kai didaskein achri hês hêmeras . . . anelêmphthê. êrxato relates to the "beginning" of Lk. 3:23. The "day he was taken up" is like 9:51, where Jesus "set his face" to go to Jerusalem en tô symplêrousthai tas hêmaras tês analêmpseôs autou. The point of beginning is not explicit here, but the "end" is specified as the day of Ascension, the end to which Jesus had to go (Lk. 9:31; 9:51; 24:26).

Acts 1:21-22 is similar. Here, too, Jesus' Ascension is mentioned (cf. Lk. 9:51; Acts 1:1-11), as is Jesus' "beginning" (cf. Lk. 3:23). The beginning of Jesus and the baptism of John are closely related, but the connection is vague (arxamenos apo tou baptismatos Iôannou).

In Acts 13:24 arxamenos is missing, but its function is taken by the term eisodou. John is said to have preached before this "entrance" and in vs. 25 it was when John was "completing his course" that he spoke of the one coming after him (met' eme). Here a temporal separation is made between John and Jesus reflecting the order of Lk. 3:1-22, 23 (see section D of this chapter below).

Finally, Acts 10:37-38 uses many of the same expressions as the above passages. Once again "all Judea" is mentioned with the beginning from Galilee (cf. Lk. 23:5; 4:14, 43-44). Here it is specified that the "beginning" took place "after" (meta) the baptism which John preached, which, like Acts 13:24-25, reflects the sequence of Lk. 3:1-22, 23.

---

[1]W. C. Robinson, Jr., Der Weg, pp. 30ff.

[2]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 41.

What, then, does Lk. 16:16 mean? It was noted above that the problem of its interpretation involves the meanings of mechri and apo tote. In the light of the pattern which emerges from the verses surveyed above it appears best to understand mechri in an inclusive sense, that is, including John the Baptist with the Law and the Prophets. The phrase apo tote would be non-inclusive of John, meaning "since then." In the actual redaction of the material involving John, John's ministry is in fact separated from that of Jesus and prior to it. Jesus appears only after the work of John is completed. Also, John's preaching does not include the Kingdom of God, as it does in Matthew (Mt. 3:1). In Luke the preaching of the Kingdom is associated with Jesus, and he was sent to do this (4:43, which also is Luke's redaction). The Kingdom is not mentioned in Luke until after Jesus is on the road.[1]

W. C. Robinson, Jr. makes a big point of the variation in these schematic statements (e.g., apo in Acts 1:22 instead of meta as in Acts 10:37) in his arguments against Conzelmann's view of the separation of John and Jesus and of Lucan de-eschatologization. He claims that the variation "widerspricht dem Interesse an einer exakten Definition, wie Conzelmann es für das Lukasevangelium behauptet;"[2] and concludes that "die lukanischen Schriften geben im übrigen keinen Hinweis darauf, dass Lukas eine deutlich gezeichnete Trennungslinie zwischen Johannes und Jesus ziehen wollte . . . ."[3] But the argument,

---

[1]Grundmann takes the opposite understanding (Evangelium, p. 323): "Das Gesetz und die Propheten haben eine begrenzte Zeit bis zu Johannes dem Täufer, dessen Auftreten eine eschatologische Grenzscheide zwischen den Zeiten bedeutet. Von diesem Zeitpunkt an (apo tote, wie 12,52 apo tou nyn) wird die Herrschaft Gottes proklamiert." The phrase apo tou nyn is Lucan, meaning "from this moment," or, more generally, "from hence-forth," but cannot determine the meaning of apo tote. The ambiguity in 16:16 belongs to apo tote and mechri together, that is, to determining the right point of reference. Only Luke's own redaction can determine the specific sense.

[2]Robinson, Der Weg, p. 13.

[3]Ibid. Robinson is also arguing against Wilckens, who treats Acts 10:37 and 13:24, in Missionsreden, pp. 101ff.

that since these verses vary in precision and therefore Luke did not make a line of separation, is a non sequitur. Moreover, in arguing with Conzelmann by making light of the separation between John and Jesus to disprove de-eschatologizing, Robinson is accepting Conzelmann's view that if there is a separation it must be a sign of de-eschatologizing. This is itself a non sequitur. Furthermore, some of the schematic verses are precise (Acts 10:37; 13:24) and the imprecise (Lk. 16:16; Acts 1:21-22) should be understood in their light, not vice versa. As for Acts 1:22 (arxamenos apo tou baptismatos Iôannou), the "beginning" must refer to Lk. 3:23, which is broken off from the "baptism of John" (3:21) in Luke's redaction. Besides, the "baptism of John" is depicted by Luke as having been completed before Jesus' reception of the Spirit (3:21). Robinson's view that Luke's redaction in 3:19-22 is in the interest of anti-Baptist apologetic is hard to accept in view of the importance Luke gives to John as a part of the Plan of God.

It is evident from the preceding study of Luke's redaction of the tradition in 3:1-22 and 7:18-35 that both together must be taken into consideration to determine Luke's view of the significance of John. Luke has made his own contributions in both chapters, and has related them by his own redaction. Some preliminary conclusions about Luke's understanding of John can be drawn on the basis of this redaction. The sequence which Luke's redaction presupposes is this: John preaches the Good News to the people; the whole people is baptized; John is imprisoned; Jesus appears. Even if the reference to John's imprisonment were lacking, Jesus' appearance is still placed after the completion of John's ministry, which is marked by the baptism of the whole people. John and Jesus are kept apart, John's ministry being completed prior to the appearance of Jesus. The completion of John's ministry becomes the sign of preparation for Jesus' coming. John is described as a preacher and teacher, who calls for repentance and the fruits of repentance on the basis of his

proclamation of the Christ and salvation. His announcement of the Stronger One is made into a specific announcement of the coming of the Messiah. His preaching of repentance and his ethical teaching are related to this announcement. His whole ministry is thus summed up as "preaching Good News to the people." In this way he fulfills the forerunner prophecy and prepares the way of the Lord. Later it is John himself who recognizes the messianic character of Jesus' ministry and brings the question of his identity into the open. John is pre-eminently a preacher of the Christ and as such belongs to the Plan of God.

D. Texts in Acts

In Acts the material about John is not of great quantity, but is nevertheless helpful for the study of the Lucan understanding of John's significance. These texts may be classified into three groups: the saying about water baptism and spirit baptism (1:5; 11:16); passages which summarize in a schematic way the ministry of John and the beginning of Jesus' ministry (1:21-22; 10:37; 13:23-25); and two pericopes concerning those who know John's baptism but not the Holy Spirit (18:24-19:7).

In Acts 1:5 and 11:16 the following words are used as a saying of Jesus (the word order is that of 1:5):

Iôannês men ebaptisen hydati,
hymeis de en pneumati baptisthêsesthe hagiô.

The obvious import of the saying involves a differentiation between John's baptism by water while in the new time which is now coming the Holy Spirit will be a baptizing element. In the "Q" tradition which Luke uses John himself had made this prediction in reference to the Stronger One (Lk. 3:17):

autos hymas baptisei en pneumati hagiô kai pyri.

The fire in John's prediction is dropped in the saying in Acts, but not from the story. As far as Luke is concerned the important thing in the new time is not the water, nor the fire, but the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit.

The saying in Acts has two important contexts, Pentecost and the Mission to the Gentiles, both of which are based upon the action of the Holy Spirit.

In 1:5 the saying continues with the clause ou meta pollas tautas hêmeras. The whole context is one of promise. In vs. 4 Jesus commanded the disciples to remain in Jerusalem to await the epaggelian tou patros which he had made to them. The saying in vs. 5 recites the promise,--soon they will be baptized by the Spirit. In vs. 8 this baptism by the Spirit will be the source of "power," and by this power they shall be witnesses to the end of the earth. The fulfillment of the promise here recited is obviously begun with the story of Pentecost. That event consisted of the coming of the Holy Spirit (and fire!)(Acts 2:1-21). A new eschatological time begins which is characterized by the activity of the Spirit in a new way not yet available when John was baptizing. Now it is "the last days" which Joel prophesied (Acts 2:17).

Water baptism is not abrogated in the text of Acts. It remains, in fact, an essential part of the economy of salvation and, like John's baptism, is called for as a mark of repentance (Acts 2:37-38). But now in the "last days" something new is at work.

In 11:16 Peter recalls the saying of Jesus from 1:5, in the context of his explanation of the events at Cornelius' house. In this case the Spirit fell upon Peter's listeners before he had finished speaking, apart from baptism by water. It is the Spirit's action that leads to the conclusion in 11:18. "Then to the Gentiles also God has granted repentance unto life." In 10:48 Peter commanded that they be baptized even though the Spirit had already come upon them. Baptism by water continues in the time of the church, but the Holy Spirit is the church's power.

Three passages in Acts, all in discourses, sum up the ministry of John and its relation to the ministry of Jesus, i.e., 1:21-22; 10:37-38; 13:23-25. It might be helpful to set the passages together for comparison.

1:21-22. en panti chronô hô
eisêlthen kai exêlthen eph' hêmas ho kyrios Iêsous,
arxamenos apo tou baptismatos Iôannou
heôs tês hêmeras hês anelêmphthê aph' hêmôn . . .

10:37-38. hymeis oidate to genomenon rêma kath' holês tês
Ioudaias,
arxamenos apo tês Galilaias meta to baptisma
ho ekêryxen Iôannês,
Iêsoun ton apo Nazareth
hôs echrisen auton ho theos pneumati hagiô
kai dynamei . . .

13:23-25. êgagen tô Israêl sôtêra Iêsoun,
prokêryxantos Iôannou pro prosôpou tês eisodou autou
baptisma metanoias panti tô laô Israêl.
hôs de eplêrou Iôannês ton droman, elegen
ti eme hyponoeite einai, ouk eimi egô
all' idou erchetai met' eme hou ouk eimi axios
to hypodêma tôn podôn lysai.

In 1:21-22 Peter states the requirements which must be met by the man who replaces Judas, i.e., that he must have been present during "the whole time" Jesus went in and out among them. "The whole time" is defined as "from the baptism of John up to the day on which he was taken up from us." That the "day of Ascension" is the final limit of Jesus' story is evident also from Lk. 9:51; Acts 1:1-11. Here the expression arxamenos recalls Jesus' "beginning" at Lk. 3:23 (cf. 23:5; Acts 10:37), but the expression "from the baptism of John" is at the most vague, and the close relation of the "beginning" and the "baptism of John" is undefined.

If we take "from the baptism of John" to refer to John's ministry the line is in tension with Luke's redaction in Ch. 3, where Jesus' "beginning" (3:23) is set apart from John's ministry (3:19-20, 21). But if we take it to refer to Lk. 3:21-23 the tension remains, since the story of Jesus' baptism has been changed by Luke into an Anointing story. The term apo, moreover, is simply not very precise. James M. Robinson has suggested that Acts 1:22 is actually "co-ordinate with Mark 1.1ff., . . ."[1] W. C. Robinson, Jr. argued that this vagueness contradicts the view that the Lucan redaction was intended

---

[1]James M. Robinson, History in Mark, p. 22.

to make a definite separation between John and Jesus.[1] The passage, however, must be interpreted in terms of Luke's redaction and in the light of his separation of John and Jesus. The separation is supported by statements elsewhere in Luke-Acts. These verses clearly reflect Lucan interests and can be compared to other Lucan passages. It would not be the proper method to take the vagueness of "from the baptism of John" in 1:21-22 as the key to understanding how John's ministry and Jesus' beginning are related. It is proper, rather, to look for more explicit statements and interpret the vague in their light. Acts 10:37f. and 13:23ff. agree with the Lucan redaction in Lk. 3:1-23. These passages will now be considered.

In Acts 10:37-38a the phrase "the things which happened in all of Judea" recalls the description of Lk. 23:5, as does the term arxamenos apo tês Galilaios. The "beginning" was also refered to in the vague Acts 1:21-22. Here, however, Luke states explicitly that the arxamenos occurred "after (meta) the baptism which John preached." The passage as a whole agrees with the Lucan redaction in Lk. 3. The definite expression "after" reflects the use of archomenos in Lk. 3:23, which follows Jesus' anointing, which is turn takes place after John's arrest is narrated. Moreover, in Lk. 3-4 the mention of "Galilee" also occurs after the anointing takes place. "Galilee" is dropped in Lk. 3:21 from the Marcan baptism account and taken up only when the narration of Jesus' preaching is begun (4:14; cf. 4:43-44). It is significant that in vs. 38 Luke begins the outline of Jesus' ministry by reference to "how God anointed him with the Holy Spirit and power." In Lk. 3 this is the pivotal event between the ministry of John and the "beginning" of Jesus and is written as an "anointing by the Spirit" rather than as a baptism (3:21-22; cf. 4:16-21). The phrase "which John preached" also recalls the Lucan redaction of John's ministry in that there his

---

[1] W. B. Robinson, Jr., Der Weg, p. 13.

preaching and teaching receive the greatest emphasis.[1] It is safe to conclude, therefore, that this passage expresses the Lucan view of the relation of John and Jesus and may be used to interpret his understanding of John the Baptist.[2] It treats John as a preacher and expresses the separation between John's time and Jesus' time which is evident in Lk. 3:1-23.

Acts 13:23-25 is like 10:37-38a in that it is not vague about the relation of John and Jesus and in that it agrees with the Lucan redaction of John's ministry in Lk. 3. In vs. 24 it is said that "John preached a baptism of repentance beforehand." The "baptism of repentance," while a theme fully used by Luke, comes of course from pre-Lucan tradition. The "preaching beforehand," however, is characteristic of Luke both in the use of the pro- prefix and in the emphasis on "preaching" (cf. Lk. 1:17, 76; Acts 10:37).[3] The temporal precedence that is implied, moreover, is definitely set forth in the expression "before his entrance" (pro prosôpou tês eisodou autou). This refers back to sôtêra Iêsoun in vs. 23. John's proclamation, therefore, is before Jesus' "entrance." eisodou here has the same meaning as arxamenos in 10:37. It has its counterpart in the reference to Jesus' exodon in Lk. 9:31, which refers ultimately to the Ascension (cf. Lk. 9:51). John's ministry, thus, is set before the earlier limitation of Jesus' time. The phrase pro prosôpou tês eisodou is drawn from Mal. 3:1, where it refers to the messenger rather than to the Lord. Finally, in vs. 24, John's preaching is "to all the people of Israel." "Israel" and "the people" are consistently noted by Luke as the recipients of John's ministry (cf. Lk. 1:16, 17, 77; 7:29).[4] That his ministry embraces "all" of Israel is also noted in Lk. 3:21.

---

[1]Wilckens, Missionsreden, p. 101f.

[2]Cf. Conzelmann, Die Apostelgeschichte. Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Vol. VII (2nd ed.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1963), p. 65.

[3]Cf. Conzelmann, Apostelgeschichte, p. 75, who notes that vs. "24 ist lukanisch in Sprache und Sache."

[4]Wilckens, Missionsreden, p. 103.

Verse 25 reiterates the ministry of John as it is narrated in Lk. 3:15-18. In that passage John bore witness to the coming of a Stronger One in answer to questionings whether he might be the Christ. This was the last incident narrated on John's ministry. In Acts 13:25 this witness of John is introduced by the phrase "as John completed his course."[1] In Acts the term dromos is also applied to Paul (20:24). That John "completed" his course is indicated in Luke by the narrative of his arrest (following his witness to the Stronger One) and by the statement in 3:21 that "the whole people" was baptized. Two additional elements are included in Acts 13:25. One is the explicit statement by John that "I am not (he)." The other is the statement in the witness to the one who comes that he comes "after me" (met' eme). The omission of opisô mou in Lk. 3:16, as was noted above, may have had an apologetic purpose. Here, however, the expression met' eme has an explicitly temporal sense. Jesus comes "after" John; John preaches "before" Jesus' entrance. met' eme should be compared to Acts 19:4 (met' auton).

In summary, John the Baptist is a preacher whose work occurs before the time of Jesus. His ministry is directed to Israel and consists of preaching repentance and baptism, but also bearing witness to the one who comes after him. When his task was completed the "Savior Jesus" appeared and was anointed by the Spirit. The time sequence presented by these texts is this: John preaches a baptism of repentance; he bears witness to the one who follows him; he completes his course; Jesus appears and is anointed. It is the same point of view which emerges from the redaction of Luke in Lk. 3:1-23.

Finally, John the Baptist is treated by Luke in the two connected stories of Apollos and the disciples at Ephesus, in Acts 18:24-19:7. In 18:24-28 Apollos appeared in Ephesus as

---

[1] Cf. Conzelmann, Apostelgeschichte, p. 76; Wilckens, Missionsreden, pp. 103f.

one who was knowledgable about Jesus (vss. 24-25a), and in fact "he taught the things concerning Jesus accurately" (vs. 25b), although Apollos, however, knew "only the baptism of John" (epistamenos monon to baptisma Iôannou). Priscilla and Aquila met him and presented the way of God to him "more accurately" (vs. 26).

The differentiation that is made between Apollos and the Christians represented by Priscilla and Aquila involves his knowing "only the baptism of John." This differentiation is made clear by Acts 1:5 and 11:16, and by a comparison of Lk. 3:1-20 with Acts 2:37-38. The contrast between John's baptism by water and baptism by the Holy Spirit has already been discussed. Acts 1:5 and 11:16 are used to present the promise of the Holy Spirit "in the last days." Pentecost inaugurated the time in which the eschatological Spirit was active. But Apollos knew only the "baptism of John," not the baptism of the eschatological Spirit. It is this information which Apollos needed to learn "more accurately" even though he had "accurate" information about Jesus. Comparison of Lk. 3:1-20 with Acts 2:37-38 also shows this. The Christian baptism of Acts 2:38, like John's, is a "baptism of repentance for the forgiveness of sins," but it is also "into the name of Jesus" and is connected with "the gift of the Holy Spirit." Apollos, therefore, was knowledgable, but "behind the times." While it is not said that Apollos was re-baptized or that he received the Spirit, it must be the new elements of Acts 2:38 of which he is now informed.

The problem continues in 19:1-7, a story of some men who were unaware of the Spirit. Paul finds some "disciples" in Ephesus and asks if they received the Holy Spirit when they believed (vs. 2). These disciples did not even know the Spirit was available (vs. 2). The sentence all' oud'ei pneuma hagion estin êkousamen has been variously interpreted. The usual translation is that "we have not heard that there is a Holy Spirit." Some scholars, however, have translated to this effect: "We did not hear that the Holy Spirit is here."

In the latter case the disciples knew that there "is a Holy Spirit", but not that he had become active.[1] In either case these disciples were unaware that the Holy Spirit was actively present in their time.

Conzelmann rightly points out that "der Dialog setzt voraus, dass Taufe und Geist zusammengehören."[2] This connection was shown above (see Acts 2:38; 8:14ff.). Paul is therefore moved to ask them into what they were baptized (eis ti oun ebaptisthête?). They answered, eis to Iôannou baptisma (vs. 3). These disciples, thus, were in the same condition as Apollos. They were "behind the times" in the same way that Apollos was "behind the times" (and as the Pharisees were "behind the times" in Lk. 16:14-16).

In order to clarify the situation Paul recites John the Baptist's work (vs. 4).

Iôannês ebaptisen baptisma metanoias,
tô laô legôn eis ton erchomenon met' auton
hina pisteusôsen,
tout' estin eis ton Iêsoun.

The following points may be noted about this recital. John's baptism was one of repentance, as it was stated in Lk. 3:3. This was also true of Christian baptism (Acts 2:38), but Christian baptism was also connected with the gift of the Spirit. John, however, pointed away from himself to the future, i.e., he was "speaking to the people that they might believe in the one who comes after him" (cf. Lk. 3:15-18). His baptism was not without this witness. This line has definite contacts with the Lucan presentation of John elsewhere, e.g., the witnesses tô laô (Lk. 1:17, 77; 3:18, 21; 7:29; Acts 13:24) and speaks of the one coming "after" him (met' auton; cf. Acts 13:25). This was the last incident narrated by Luke and tops off his ministry (Lk. 3:15-18; Acts 13:25).

---

[1]See Haenchen, Apostelgeschichte, p. 488 for the first view, and his n. 4 for criticism of those who hold the second. Another example of one who holds the second is J. Jeremias, Jesus als Weltvollender (Beiträge zur Forderung christlicher Theologie 33; Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1930), 209.

[2]Conzelmann, Apostelgeschichte, p. 110.

Paul clarifies this aspect of John's preaching for the "disciples" with the phrase "that is, in Jesus." This name "Jesus" is one of the new elements of baptism in Acts (2:38). Paul therefore is saying, in response to the fact that the disciples were baptized into John's baptism, that John himself was pointing forward to someone else, Jesus.

The immediate result is that "when they heard this they were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus" (vs. 5). Paul's recital of John's witness is the cause of their reaction, and this baptism is thus presented as the proper response to the message of John, since he, too, is a preacher of the Christ. These disciples, therefore, are brought up to date to participate in that to which John himself had pointed forward.

At this point the "disciples" are able to receive the Holy Spirit (vs. 6) which they did not originally know about (vs. 2). Hence, through a recital of John's message they are able to participate in "the last days."

The fault of Apollos and the "disciples" of Ephesus was not that they knew the baptism of John, but that they had not yet come as far as John himself had. John had pointed his hearers to the future, that is, to the coming of the Christ and had predicted baptism by the Spirit. This new time is now present, according to Paul, and the whole book of Acts. It was sufficient to remind them of what John had said for them to be baptized "in the name of Jesus" (vs. 5) and receive the gift of the Spirit (vs. 6).

It is clear, from the apologetic point of view, that Luke considered any disciple of the Baptist who had not become a follower of Jesus to have missed the point of his master's message. There is, however, no anti-baptist polemic involved here. John is presented in positive terms as a preacher of Christ. He had performed the important function of preparing "the people" for the time of messianic fulfillment. Paul needed only to remind the disciples in the baptism of John of John's orientation to the future. In this passage John's role is not set forth in a negative way, as one who

is inferior to Jesus, but his positive function in relation to Jesus is emphasized. If his followers will hear his message they will become followers of Jesus.

One thing that can be noted from the preceding analysis of Lucan texts is the consistency of Luke's treatment of John the Baptist from the Infancy stories through the texts of Acts. We turn, in what follows, to the task of synthesis, that of determining the role of John the Baptist in Lucan theology.

IV. John the Baptist in Lucan Theology

A. The Fulfillment of Eschatological Prophecy

In chapter II we have noted how the category Prophecy and Fulfillment is basic to the development and structure of Lucan theology and how his major themes are grounded in the fulfillment of eschatological prophecies. John the Baptist is no exception. As the forerunner of the Lord he is also one who fulfills eschatological prophecies. It should be noted that these prophecies are unquestionably eschatological in character. Eschatological speculation in late Judaism fastened on Elijah, as on Enoch, by reason of the mysterious end of his career: Elijah was rapt to heaven in a flaming chariot (II Kgs. 2:11). Thus, the Deutero-Isaian motif of "preparation" for "the way of the Lord" (Isa. 40:3) was developed by Malachi and later by Sirach in terms of Elijah's return to earth with a mission of reconciliation, preparatory to judgment, at the end of time. The purpose of this section is to examine how Luke has used these prophecies to develop his understanding of John.

1. The Malachi Prophecy in Luke-Acts

The expectation of a forerunner is derived from the Malachi prophecy of the return of Elijah. In Mal. 3:1 it is announced that the Lord's messenger will come before him and make his way clear. Then the Lord himself will come to his temple. In 3:22-23 the messenger is named: it is Elijah who will come before the Day of the Lord to turn the hearts of fathers and children to each other. The LXX version appears like this:

(Mal. 3:1-2a) idou egô exapostellô ton aggelon mou, kai epiblepsetai hodon pro prosôpou mou, kai exaiphnês hêxei eis ton naon heautou kyrios, hon hymeis zêteite, kai ho aggelos tês diathêkês, hon hymeis thelete· idou erchetai, legei kyrios pantokratôr. kai tis hypomenei hêmeran eisodou autou; ê tis hypostêsetai en tê optasia autou;

(Mal. 3:22-23) kai idou egô apostellô hymin Êlian ton Thesbitên prin elthein hêmeran kyriou tên megalên kai epiphanê, hos apokatastêsei kardian patros pros huion kai kardian anthrôpou pros ton plêsion autou, mê elthô kai pataxô tên gên ardên.

The first allusion to the Malachi prophecy in Luke is 1:17 (kai autos proeleusetai emôpion autou en pneumati kai dynamei Êliou, epistrepsai kardias paterôn epi tekna kai apeitheis en phronêsei dikaiôn, hetoimasai kyriô laon kateskeuasmenon).

The difference of the sentence in 1:17 from the LXX version, i.e., the verb epistrepsai for apokatastêsei, and the plural kardias, paterôn and tekna, has led many commentators to suppose reliance on the Hebrew. This cannot be certain, however, since New Testament references to Malachi are regularly at variance with our LXX text so that we might also suppose another Greek tradition was available. In Mal. 3:1 the LXX epiblepsetai is a translation of the Hebrew pānāh (=turn), which used with derek (=way) means "make clear, or free of obstacles."[1] As such it is used in Isa. 40:3 and Mal. 3:1. But the Greek translations are not consistent. Isa. 40:3 LXX has hetoimasate tên hodon (cf. Mk. 1:3par) where Mal. 3:1 has epiblepsetai hodon. But in the New Testament the citations of Mal. 3:1 have a third translation, kataskeuasei tên hodon (Mk. 1:2; Mt. 11:10; Lk. 7:27). The New Testament version of Mal. 3:1 also has apostellô for LXX exapostellô (but cf. Mal. 3:22). The kateskeuasmenon of 1:17 reflects this Synoptic/New Testament version. The difference is also reflected in Sirach's chapter on Elijah, in 48:10, where he

---

[1]Brown, Francis, Driver, S. R. and Briggs, Charles A., A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, based on the Lexicon of William Gesenius as translated by Edward Robinson (Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1953), 815.

uses epistrepsai like Luke, but with singular nouns like LXX. Luke uses epistrepsai regularly, more than any other New Testament writer; he uses the LXX apokathistanô in Acts 1:6 applied to Jesus, but it is an action which Jesus puts off.[1] It is probably correct, therefore, to say with Benoit that Luke takes the text of Malachi under an evolved form of which Sir. 48:10 furnishes another example.[2] Another point of comparison with Sirach is the reference in 48:12 to Elisha being "filled with his Spirit" (kai Elisaie eneplêsthê pneumatos autou; cf. Lk. 1:15).

In any case the character of 1:17 is determined by the Malachi prophecy and its hope for the Messenger/Elijah. Here the functions of "going before" the Lord (the verb proeleusetai, like the proporeusê of 1:76, is an independent expression of the hope), and "turning" are given specifically to John, so that he fulfills the forerunner prophecy. It is true that the passage does not say John is Elijah, such as Mt. 11:14; 17:12-13 do, but the office of Elijah is ascribed to him nevertheless. Lk. 1:17 is the "explication of his real task."[3]

---

[1]The Synoptic tradition does know the translation apokathistanô, Mk. 9:12; Mt. 17:11.

[2]Benoit, "L'Enfance," p. 181. See N. Turner, "Relation to Hebrew Sources," p. 101, who suggests that "the comparison with Sir. xlviii. 10 is interesting, because it shows the way in which the early Greek version of the Minor Prophets may have developed. Luke and Sirach agree over epistrephô, but the LXX and Sirach agree over kardian patros and pros huion. Sirach is obviously the common factor of the three, and the other two never agree against him. This is the way the tradition would seem to have developed:

Luke's LXX (divergence: plural and epi tekna)
Sirach's LXX
Our LXX (divergence: change of verb)."

[3]Vielhauer, "Benedictus," p. 259. Vielhauer believes John is being described as a messianic figure (p. 260). "Entgegen dem ursprünglichen Sinn von Mal. 3,23f. und der sich daran knüpfenden jüdischen Erwartungen spricht Luk. 1,17 nicht von einer Wiederkehr Elias, sondern von der Ausübung der ihm zugeschriebenen endzeitlichen Aufgaben durch einen „in Geist und Kraft Elias" wirkenden Menschen."

The next allusion to the Malachi prophecy is Lk. 1:76 (kai su de, paidion, prophêtês hypsistou klêthêsê; proporeusê gar enôpion kyriou hetoimasai hodous autou . . .). Here, too, it is John who "goes before" the Lord. It is also stated specifically why he is forerunner, i.e., "to prepare his ways." The term hetoimasai is drawn from Isa. 40:3. John as forerunner is therefore to fulfill Isa. 40:3. The two offices of Malachian forerunner and Isaian preparer are thus combined.

In 7:27 there is a specific citation of Mal. 3:1. This is in a passage paralleled in Matthew, and the two Evangelists agree in deleting Mark's use of the prophecy at Mk. 1:2. The three passages are virtually identical except that Mt./Lk. have emprosthen sou at the end, and Luke leaves out egô. In this traditional verse the first person pronoun of the prophecy has become the second person sou. In the preceding verse (7:26) Jesus says that John is a prophet, but also more than a prophet. The Malachi citation specifies in what way he is more than a prophet by identifying him with the forerunner and preparer. Luke's addition of vss. 29-30 maintain this view about John. These are placed here as a reaction to Jesus' words about John in the preceding five verses. As noted previously, the characters involved are those who accepted or rejected John according to Luke's redaction (cf. 3:7, 10, 12, 15, 18). Thus the citation of Mal. 3:1 is here applied by Luke back to John's ministry. John has already fulfilled that prophecy. Luke, however, does not share with Matthew the statement identifying John with Elijah.

There may also be an allusion to Mal. 3:1-2 in Acts 13:24, as hinted by the expression pro prosôpou tês eisodou autou.[1] John is he who "preaches beforehand," preceding Jesus' "entrance." Verse 25 draws the statement into relation

---

[1]Cf. Wilckens, Missionsreden, p. 102; also Cadbury and Lake, Beginnings, Vol. IV, p. 152, who write that "pro prosôpou tês eisodou is a Hebraism which Torrey claims as an instance of translation. But it may be due to the LXX version of the proof text about John from Malachi iii.1 ton aggelou . . . pro prosôpou mou . . . hêmeran eisodou autou."

to Luke's own version of John's ministry in Lk. 3:15ff., where John's witness to the one to come was indeed the last activity reported before his course was fulfilled. In Acts 13:24 eisodou refers to Jesus, who has a corresponding exodon (Lk. 9:31; cf. Acts 1:21-22). In the Malachi prophecy eisodou refers to the forerunner himself. The shift in reference, however, requires no more than an easy misreading or a little imagination. The name "Elijah" is not mentioned here.

There is the question of the identity of this Lord before whom John goes. In Acts 13:24, of course, Jesus is named, and in Lk. 7:27 (and therefore the tradition, but here also Luke) the pronoun sou makes Mal. 3:1 an address to the Messiah. In 1:17 and 1:76, however, positive identification with Jesus is not made. Lk. 1:76 by itself is ambiguous. Lk. 1:17 by itself, however, must be taken to be a reference to the forerunner of God, pointing back to 1:16 (epi kyrion to theon autôn). As noted above, however, Luke has overcome this tension, especially through the use of "Lord" in the Visitation story by Elizabeth (1:43). Taken alone, 1:15-17 have no relation to messianic hope, since John is here forerunner of God. But in the Lucan story Jesus becomes the Lord (cf. 1:43, 76; 2:11; 3:4). John ultimately prepares the way for Jesus--in fact, the Messiah. That is the course he must follow. The one constant in the variety of allusions to the Malachi prophecy in Luke-Acts is the application of the function of forerunner of the Lord to John the Baptist. The purpose of the forerunner is to prepare the Lord's way. The Lord is Jesus.

It has already been seen that Luke avoids making an identification of John with Elijah, even though John fulfills the forerunner prophecy and performs the function which was expected of the returned Elijah. The reason for Luke's reticence in this matter is uncertain, though it may be to insure against misunderstanding of John's status. Also, Elijah appears to have a role in the stories of Jesus' doxa (9:28ff.; 24:4; Acts 1:10). Conzelmann's further conclusion that John is also not regarded by Luke as the forerunner is

untenable. Even if the Infancy narratives are not considered, Luke's redaction in 7:24ff. clearly undergirds Jesus' application of Mal. 3:1 to John.

It should be noted that the other element of Mal. 3:1f. is also fulfilled in Luke, i.e., the coming of the Lord (Jesus) to the Temple. Laurentin has pointed this out for the Infancy narratives themselves.[1] He understands the fulfillment of the Lord's coming to the Temple to be related in Lk. 2:22-39.[2] Actually he did not carry his thought far enough, and failed to relate 2:41-52 to the Malachi hope. This last pericope of the Infancy narratives establishes the identity and destiny of Jesus as the Son of God. In 2:49 Jesus' destiny is expressed by the dei of being in his father's house. He is compelled to be en tô hierô. The pattern of the story is replayed in the Travel narrative (9:51-19:46), which culminates with his entering the Temple (19:45-46). The last section of his ministry then consists of his teaching en tô hierô (cf. 2:46; 19:47; 21:37). It is also interesting that with the omission of the Fig Tree incident by Luke the first discussion in the section of Temple teaching becomes one which involves the significance of John the Baptist (20:1-8). If Jesus' questioners could not bear the truth about John then they could not bear the truth about Jesus. John is he who goes before the Lord; Jesus is the Lord who comes to the Temple.

The Infancy narratives tell of John's relation to Jesus as forerunner. Jesus' ministry does not begin until John's day (1:80) and function (1:15ff., 76) are fulfilled (cf. Acts 13:24-25). With Jesus' own statement in 2:40ff. of his identity and destiny, the stage is set for John's anadeixêôs, to witness, forerun, and prepare (3:1-20). Then the door is open for Jesus' ministry to begin (3:23). Thus John's ministry as forerunner begins (3:1) once Jesus is identified as he who must be in the Temple.

---

[1]René Laurentin, Structure et Théologie de Luc I-II (Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1957), 56-60

[2]Ibid., pp. 58-59.

2. The Isaiah 40 Prophecy in Luke-Acts

Isa. 40:3-5 is another prophecy according to which early Christians judged the role and significance of John the Baptist and which determines his relation to Jesus. This was true in the pre-Lucan tradition. Mark opened his gospel by citing, with Mal. 3:1, the words of Isa. 40:3 with reference to John's ministry. Luke not only took over the citation, but extended it to include the next two verses (less 40:5a) so that it ends with the universalistic promise that "all flesh shall see the salvation of God" (3:6). The citation then becomes more than a proof of John's fulfillment of prophecy, but also a pointer to what is about to take place. It is John who is the phônê boôntos, and thus through the citation he is a witness to the coming of salvation. Luke, however, does more than simply add more prophecy in order to include the note of universalism. The two parts of the prophecy--the way preparing and the coming of salvation--are also refered to in Chs. 1-2 with application to both John and Jesus, so that, like Mal. 3, the prophecy grounds not only John's role but also the relation of John and Jesus. The preparing of the way determines the work of John (1:17, 76; 3:4); the coming of salvation describes the appearance of Jesus (2:25, 30; 3:6; Acts 28:28). The introduction of the motif of salvation, moreover, provides a rationale for Luke's history. Luke-Acts becomes a description of the reaction of Israel and of "all flesh" to the salvation of God.[1]

The motif of salvation had already been introduced in the Infancy narratives. The relation of 3:6 to the Simeon story stands out, where in his song Isa. 40:5b is cited. In 2:25 Simeon's waiting for the "paraklêsin of Israel" is a reference to Isa. 40:1. Then, when finally Jesus is presented to him, it is he who exclaims that his "eyes have seen your salvation" (2:30), which refers to Isa. 40:5. He who awaits the comforting sees the salvation. The same universalistic

---

[1]See W. C. Robinson, Jr., Der Weg, pp. 39-43; Dupont, "Salut des Gentils," pp. 137-138.

note as in 3:6 is present in his song. This salvation, as well as being the "glory of Israel," is a "light for the Gentiles." With the pervasive nationalistic tenor of Chs. 1-2, which proclaims the birth of the Messiah of Israel, Simeon becomes the first Lucan spokesman of universalism and the Gentile mission. He has a dual role, however, for he also becomes the first to express, by way of prophecy, the rejection of Jesus by his own people (2:34-35). A sword was about to pierce Israel's heart.[1] Anna is an analogue to Simeon. She spoke to those "awaiting the redemption of Jerusalem" (2:38). But in Luke Israel is not consoled but divided, and Jerusalem is not redeemed but judged.[2]

Luke's extension of the citation, then, does more than introduce the thought of universalism. It also provides a foil for the development of his story, which gradually moves from Israel to "all flesh," and includes the tragedy of rejection. The next use of Isa. 40:5b is at the end, Acts 28:28. Here there is a connection between beginning and end, but also a tension. Paul, in Rome, addresses a Jewish audience and invokes Isa. 6:9f. They cannot understand nor perceive what is taking place, because their eyes and ears are closed. Therefore, says Paul, "this salvation of God is sent to the Gentiles." That is where Luke concludes. The judgment of F. F. Bruce is correct: "Thus, while Ac. records the expansion of the Gospel among the Gentiles, it also records progressively its rejection by the greater part of the Jewish nation."[3] This is the direction of all of Luke-Acts, with Simeon its prophet. Luke-Acts begins with Israel; it ends with the Gentiles.[4]

[1]Supposing Mary to be representative of Israel. This has been argued by Laurentin, Structure et Théologie, pp. 148ff.; Pierre Benoit, "'Et toi-même, un glaive te transpercera l'âme!' (Luc 2,35)," CBQ, XXV (July, 1963), 251-261.

[2]Cf. Flender, St. Luke, pp. 27-30, 107ff.

[3]F. F. Bruce, The Acts of the Apostles (Chicago and Toronto: The Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, 1952), 479. Cf. Haenchen, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 644-647.

with the Gentiles.[1] Conzelmann states only part of the case when he writes that

> the completion of the quotation (i.e., Lk. 3:4-6) beyond what Mark gives introduces a universal note (cf. Lukeiii, 30f., and especially Acts xxviii, 28). There is a correspondence between the beginning and the end of the whole work, Scripture providing the theme.[2]

Luke uses the salvation terminology more than the other Evangelists, especially in the Infancy narratives. The neuter form sôtêrion is used in the three passages discussed above which are drawn from Isa. 40:5. But the feminine sôtêria is also used in the gospel four times, three with reference to the Messiah in the Benedictus (1:69, 71, 77), and once in the story of Zacchaeus (19:9). All of Luke's references are peculiar to him. Zechariah exults that God has "raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David" (1:69). The reference to the "house of David" identifies the "horn of salvation" as Jesus (cf. 1:27, 32; 2:4). It fulfills the words of the prophets that there should be "salvation from our enemies" (1:71). John the Baptist is related to the concept in the same song, for it will be his task to "give knowledge of salvation" (1:77), which stands in apposition to hetoimasai hodous autou (1:76; Isa. 40:3). John's task, as described in 1:76f., thus involves both elements of the full citation of Isa. 40:3-5 in 3:4-6, viz., preparing the way and the coming of salvation.

The term occurs once more in Lk. 19:9 where Jesus makes the statement to Zacchaeus that "today salvation has come to this house." That statement must be seen as parallel to 19:6: "For today it is necessary for me to stay in your

---

[1]Cf. J. van Goudoever, "The Place of Israel in Luke's Gospel," NovT, VIII (1966), 111-113.

[2]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 161 (first parenthesis mine); cf. W. C. Robinson, Jr., p. 39: "Mit eben diesem Text--der den Weg des Herrn zu den Heiden hervorhebt--beginnt und beendet Lukas seine Darstellung." Robinson, with good reason, sees Luke's use of Isa. 40 as determinative of the form of his Heilsgeschichte, cf. p. 43.

house." With the coming of Jesus there corresponds the coming of salvation. This is true also of 2:30; 3:6; 1:69, 77.

It is evident that Luke uses the terms sôtêrion and sôtêria in a semi-titular way as references to the Messiah, i.e., to Jesus. Leaney has pointed out that 1:69, 71, 77; 2:30; 19:9 are connected with the presence of the Messiah; thus , in 3:6, the expression "salvation of God" "is for Luke apparently equivalent to the Messiah, or the Messiah and his kingdom."[1] The terms occur in no other context. Isa. 40:5 proclaims that "all flesh shall see the salvation of God," and Luke makes use of it to show that this is accomplished with the coming of Jesus.[2]

While Luke uses the Isa. 40 prophecy to show that the coming of salvation corresponds to the coming of Jesus (2:30; 3:6), he also uses it to show how John and Jesus are related. John also fulfills the prophecy as the one who bears witness to the coming of salvation and prepares the way. "Das Heil Gottes wird durch Johannes allen Völkern vorbereitet; der alte Simeon hat es bereits gesehen."[3] In 3:4 John is the "voice crying in the wilderness" who calls for preparation of the way, since preparation is the necessary prerequisite for the promise of 3:6 (Isa. 40:5b). The words of Zechariah about John in 1:76-77 correspond to the two aspects of the

---

[1]Leaney, St. Luke, p. 106; cf. Sahlin, Messias und Gottesvolk, p. 255, n. 2.

[2]In 2:9 doxa kyriou recalls Isa. 40:5a, which is omitted in Lk. 3:4-6, perhaps because of its prior revelation. In Luke, doxa is especially associated with Jesus. His whole dei is one which leads ultimately to doxa, though it is necessary first to suffer. Luke heightens the tension between suffering and glory in Jesus' destiny (cf. the close editing of 9:18-36 and the addition of 17:25; also 24:26). At the beginning, the doxa kyriou is revealed with Jesus' birth; at the end, Jesus must enter into glory (9:31-32; 24:26; Acts 1:10). See Brockington, "New Testament Use of DOXA," pp. 1-8.

[3]Grundmann, Evangelium, p. 102; cf. Sahlin, Messias und Gottesvolk, p. 337: "Johannes ist in seiner Person und seinem göttlichen Auftrag ein messianisches Anzeichen; er ist der endgültige Beweis dessen, dass Jesus der wahre Messias ist."

prophecy in 3:4-6, that is, the preparation of the way and the coming of salvation. In 1:76 it is John who must "go before" (proporeusê; cf the prokêryxantes of Acts 13:24, meta . . . ekêryxen Acts 10:37, kêryssôn of Lk. 1:3).and Isa. 40:3 makes explicit why, i.e., "to prepare his ways." John's work has no independent significance,[1] but has meaning only in relation to the coming of salvation. Thus vs. 77 points to salvation, as does 3:6. "To give knowledge of salvation," in apposition to "prepare his ways," is the specific purpose of way preparing.[2]

The preparation for salvation is done before its coming. Thus Luke has John fulfill his course entirely before Jesus' appearance to receive the Spirit (3:21-22). At that time Luke de-emphasizes Jesus' baptism (but does not remove it) and focuses on the Spirit reception. It is the Spirit reception that is important because it is the fulfillment of Isa. 61:1ff., and determines the character of Jesus. Luke's first section, 1:5-3:22, thus has a dual function. It announces the joyful news of the coming of salvation to Israel, and finally climaxes with the fulfillment of Isa. 61:1ff. which identifies Jesus as the Anointed One with whom salvation comes. It also announces the coming of the preparer and describes the preparation of the way. John must go before the Lord. For this reason Luke completes John's story immediately in 3:19-20. The whole section leads to the anointing in 3:21-22. John's task as way preparer is first fulfilled.[3]

---

[1]Cf. Sahlin, Messias und Gottesvolk, p. 337.

[2]Cf. Grundmann, Evangelium, p. 73. Vs. 77 should be seen in relation to 3:6 in spite of the fact that it uses the feminine form sôtêrias. Luke's use of the neuter sôtêrion is determined by direct reference to Isa. 40:5. Apart from that he prefers the feminine. Cf. his use in Acts where sôtêria is used six times, but sôtêrion only in 28:28 where Isa. 40:5 is determinative. See Dupont, "Salut des Gentils," pp. 137-138.

[3]There is a hint of Isa. 40:3 in 1:17 in the verb hetoimasai. The basis of the verse is Mal. 3:1, 22-23, but the hint of Isa. 40:3 is not surprising since both prophecies are in mind for John.

In summary, Luke's use of Isa. 40 serves three purposes. First, it provides a link between Chs. 1-2 and Ch. 3 in Luke's gospel. The citation in 3:4-6 is related to the use of the prophecy in 1:76-77 and 2:25-30. Isa. 40 is a theme of structural significance, therefore, and helps tie 1:5-3:22 together as Luke's first section with the themes of preparing the way and the coming of salvation. Secondly, it provides a link between the beginning of Luke-Acts and its end. Salvation is the theme which appears at both opening and closing. But with salvation's coming there is also division, and the story leads from Israel to the Gentiles. Finally, the use of Isa. 40, like the Malachi prophecy, serves to indicate the relation of John and Jesus and their functions. Each of them has a part in its fulfillment, Isa. 40:3 refering especially to John's function as way preparer, Isa. 40:5 to Jesus as the salvation of God. Together Mal. 3 and Isa. 40 show the separation of John from Jesus as one who appears before him in time, but also his intimate connection with Jesus in the performing of the necessary task of preparation. John and Jesus do not have an encounter, yet they presuppose each other.

3. John as an Instrument of the Plan of God

In chapter II it was shown how Luke's basic category of prophecy and fulfillment is also shaped by the related themes Plan of God, foreknowledge and determination, and dei. All of these are subsidiary expressions of the theme of fulfillment of the Scriptures. Luke thus uses a broad Greek vocabulary to develop the category Prophecy/Fulfillment. In the preceding sections John's part in the fulfillment of prophecy was examined; here we will examine the broader vocabulary as Luke relates it to John, for in 7:29-30 Luke applies the concept boulê tou theou specifically to John the Baptist.[1]

Paul Schubert rightly noted that "the theology of Luke is a many-sided development of the theme of the hôrismenê

---

[1]For what follows, cf. Flender, St. Luke, p. 143f.

boulê tou theou."[1] The expression boulê tou theou is first used by Luke in a passage peculiar to him, which identifies John as a part of the Plan of God, 7:29-30. When the Pharisees and lawyers failed to be baptized by John they "rejected the Plan of God for themselves" (tên boulê tou theou êthetêsan eis heautous). "All the people" and the "tax-collectors," on the other hand, by being baptized had accepted it. The boulê is applied to Jesus also. His deliverance, to be hanged and killed, was "by the definite plan and foreknowledge of God" (tê hôrismenê boulê kai prognôsei tbuutheou, Acts 2:23). Acts 4:28 is similar. Here the guilt for Jesus' death is generalized, but men did to him what God's "hand and plan determined beforehand to take place" (poiêsai hosa hê cheir sou kai hê boulê proôrisen genesthai). The terms here used in association with Jesus' death are not common in the gospel (but cf. the Lucan 22:22), but their theme is carried out by the ideas of dei, mellô, and the fulfillment of Scripture. (see Gamaliel asked for restraint by his peers (Acts 5:38f.) because of the question whether the new movement was the plan of men or of God. But the plan of God was not limited to John and Jesus, nor was it something new. David had served the Plan of God in his own generation (Acts 13:36). Paul in his preaching had announced the "whole plan of God" to the Ephesian elders (Acts 22:27). Luke considered the killing of Jesus to be a counter-plan, to which Joseph of Arimathea did not consent (Lk. 23:51).[2]

The plan of God is "definite" (hôrismenê; Acts 2:23). Similarly, in Lk. 22:22, in the context of his prediction of betrayal, Jesus states that the way the Son of Man goes is

---

[1]Paul Schubert, "The Final Cycle of Speeches in the Book of Acts," JBL, LXXXVII (March, 1968), 2; cf. his note #4.

[2]Cf. Schubert, "Final Cycle," p. 8: "It is a clearly articulated Lukan motif, especially in the speeches, to distinguish sharply between human and the divine Boulê and to make the former subservient to the latter (Acts 2:22-23, 3:17f., 5:38f., 13:27; see also Luke 7:30 and 23:51)." See Dupont, "Salut des Gentils," pp. 149-152, for discussion of Peter and Paul as key persons in the carrying out of the mission to the Gentiles.

"determined" (kata to hôrismenon poreuetai). But it is not only his passion which is determined; he is also the "one determined by God to be judge of living and dead" (Acts 10:42, ho hôrismenos hypo tou theou kritês zôntôn kai nekrôn). In the Areopagus speech Paul says that God "determined alloted periods and the boundaries of their habitation" (RSV) for every race (17:26, horisas prostetagmenous kairous kai tas horothesias tês katoikias autôn). At the conclusion Paul's words recall Acts 10:42. God has "fixed" a day for judgment by a "man whom he determined" (17:31, en andri hô hôrisen).

The Plan of God for Jesus' death, at least, is also said to be "determined beforehand" (Acts 4:28, proôrisen) and "foreknown" (Acts 2:23, prognôsei). Also David saw the resurrection of Christ beforehand (Acts 2:31, proïdôn), and the Holy Spirit spoke about Judas beforehand (Acts 1:16, proeipen).[1] The witnesses of the resurrection were also "appointed beforehand" by God (Acts 10:41, tois prokecheirotonêmenois).[2]

To express the determination of Jesus' life by the Plan of God in the gospel, Luke develops the Marcan concept of dei. Luke takes over the dei of Jesus' Passion (9:22). But Jesus' total ministry, death and vindication are brought under the sway of necessity.[3] At the very beginning, when Jesus himself expresses his identity he also expresses his destiny to be "in his father's house" (Lk. 2:49). In the first part of his ministry (3:23-9:50) his work is characterized by 4:43. He must preach the Kingdom of God in other

---

[1]Note here that "the Scriptures had to be fulfilled" (edei plêrôthênai tên graphên).

[2]Cf. the use of procheirizomai in Acts 3:20 (of the Christ) and Acts 22:14, 15; 26:16 (of Paul). For Paul, cf. further Acts 9:15 (skeuos eklogês) and 9:16 (dei . . . pathein). On the use of verbs with pro- by Luke, and the Plan of God, see Conzelmann, Theology, p. 151f.; Siegfried Schulz, "Gottes Vorsehung bei Lukas," ZNW, LIV (1963), 105f.

[3]Cf. Grundmann, ThDNT, II, p. 23; Conzelmann, Theology, pp. 153-154.

cities, because he was sent for this (contrast Mk. 1:35-39). In the second part of his ministry (9:51-19:46) the movement to Jerusalem is a necessity (13:33). Luke gives further emphasis to Mark's necessity of suffering (17:25; 22:37), but also Jesus' vindication (24:26). He heightens this by drawing the Suffering Son of Man and Coming Son of Man traditions closer together (e.g., the redaction of 9:18-36; 17:25; 24:26). Not only Jesus is under this compulsion, however. It is the same for Paul in Acts, for his total mission and his movement toward Rome (Acts 9:6, 16; 19:21; 23:11; 26:9; 27:24).[1] In some contexts mellô is used synonymously with dei. In Lk. 9:31 Moses and Elijah speak with Jesus about "his exodus, which he was about to accomplish in Jerusalem" (tên exodon auton, hên êmellen plêroun en Ierousalêm). In 9:44 mellei replaces the dei of the Marcan Passion saying.[2]

The accomplishment of the dei is identical for Luke with the fulfillment of Scripture. It is what is written in Scripture that determines the dei (see Acts 3:18). Scripture expresses the boulê tou theou, what God "determined beforehand." The fullest expression of Luke's dei concept is the phrase "the Scripture must be fulfilled" (22:37; 24:25b-27; 24:44; Acts 1:16). Luke can use the idea of Scripture fulfillment as a substitute for dei, 18:31.[3] Key events throughout Luke-Acts are marked as fulfillments of Scripture. The quotation of Isa. 40:3-5 set a theme returned to at the end. Jesus' beginning in Galilee (4:16ff, vs. 21) points to Isa. 61:1ff., which depends on 3:21-22. The passion story of Luke, with its emphasis on Jesus' innocence, is marked by the citation of Isa. 53:12, that he must be considered as

---

[1]The whole group of passages refering to Jesus are: 2:49; 4:43; 9:22; 13:33; 17:25; 19:5; 22:37; 24:7, 26, 44; Acts 17:3.

[2]Cf. 10:1; 22:23; 24:21; Acts 17:31.

[3]For the importance of the "fulfillment of Scripture" in Luke-Acts, see Schubert, "Luke 24," pp. 165-186; Dupont, "Salut des Gentils," pp. 132-155.

one of the lawless (22:37; cf. Acts 8:32-33).[1] The new church's mission is begun with the fulfillment of Joel 3:1-5. The turning to the Gentiles is grounded on the citation of Isa. 49:6 (Acts 13:47), and the rejection of the Jews refered to Isa. 6:9-10 (Acts 28:26-27).

The ideas of fulfillment and accomplishment are also used apart from explicit reference to Scripture. Significant divisions in the course of events are designated by the phrase en tô symplêrousthai tên hêmeran tês pentêkostês for the mission of the church (Acts 2:1), and en tô symplêrousthai tas hêmeras tês analêmpseôs autou for the mission of Jesus (Lk. 9:51). Each of these two divisions had just had their course marked out (Acts 1:8; Lk. 9:31).[2] Jesus' exodos in Jerusalem is an event "to be fulfilled" (plêroun), and Jesus' eisodos occurred after John "fulfilled his course" (eplêrou).[3]

It is apparent, then, that Luke thought of the events of which he wrote as being determined by God himself. The history of Jesus and the early church belonged to God's Plan as the eschatological fulfillment of the promise of salvation for all flesh. Within the unfolding of the divine plan God's chosen instruments had definite "ways" to follow, i.e., each had a specific task to fulfill. John's ministry was a "course" which he accomplished (dromos, Acts 13:25). Similarly, Paul's ministry was a dromos (Acts 20:24) to be "accomplished" (teleiôsô). Jesus' ministry was a "Way" which was bounded by his eisodos (Acts 13:24) and his exodos (Lk. 9:31). The verb poreuesthai gains a technical sense in Luke as the active term describing Jesus' Way (esp. 13:33; 22:22; but throughout the

---

[1]These citations of Isa. 53 cannot be used to show the idea of "vicarious suffering" in Luke, but are a part of Luke's emphasis on Jesus' innocence which Luke writes into the Passion story and reiterates in Acts (23:4, 14-15, 22, 41, 47; Acts 3:13ff.; 7:52; 13:27-28).

[2]See Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe," pp. 256ff. For John, cf. 1P80.

[3]Cf. Lk. 1:45 (teleiôsis); Lk. 13:32 (teleioô); Lk. 12:50; 18:31; 22:27; Acts 13:29 (teleô).

Travel narrative).[1] According to Luke's conception of the History of Salvation, the Old Testament provides the script detailing roles and events; Luke-Acts records the actual drama of salvation. Each distinct moment of the drama is a stage along the way. What is the role of John in this story of fulfillment?

First, John comes "before" Jesus as preparer. He has his own "time," distinguished from the time of Jesus. Lk. 16:16 is correctly interpreted in this sense. But John is not merely one among many figures belonging to the era of the Law and the prophets. He is "more than a prophet" (Lk. 7:26). True, he belongs to the past (16:16) but his mission is to clear the stage for the future (7:27). His role is played only when Israel has been readied for the advent of the Kingdom of God. With the completion of John's work, the time of Israel, according to God's plan, is brought to a close. Beyond John Israel has no further positive task in the history of salvation.

Oliver rightly notes that "the 'universal' Jesus of the Lucan account stands in marked contrast to the image of John the Baptist in Luke, about whom all the things said point to a ministry within the Jewish nation."[2] All of 1:5-3:22 is addressed to Israel or refers to its history and hopes. Its characters represent the highest ideals of Israel's piety. The births of John and Jesus point to the fulfillment of ancient hope. John's mission is limited. He fulfills his appointed role and no other. It is Jesus who will first break through the borders of Israel. But Luke does not conceive of John's limited mission negatively. Rather it is Israel's finest hour. The prevailing theme is one of promise and fulfillment and great joy (cf. 24:21).

---

[1]For significant occurrences of hodos, see 1:76, 79; 3:4; 7:27; 9:57; 20:21; Acts 9:2; 14:16; 18:25, 26; 19:9, 23; 22:4; 24:14, 22.

[2]Oliver, "Lucan Birth Stories," p. 221. Laurentin, Structure et Théologie, p. 102, says of Lk. 1-2 that "la perspective est limitée à Israël."

In an explicit redactional statement Luke makes the point that John has a role in God's Plan, and that for good or ill one's reaction to John is a reaction to that Plan (7:29-30). The fact that he is filled with the Holy Spirit from his mother's womb means that a destiny awaits him. While yet unborn he could leap in his mother's womb in witness to Jesus. The passage in 1:20 is a possible reference to this destiny (tois logois mou, hoitines plêrôthêsontai eis ton kairon autôn). "Their time" may refer back to the promise of John's birth and hence forward to the normal time of conception to birth. It may also refer to the time which God has chosen for conception and the recital in 1:15-17. The latter is indicated by the angelic announcement and the Old Testament pattern of the birth of God's instruments. The verb plêroô may mean "fill" (2:40; 3:5) or "fulfill" (1:20; 4:21; 7:1; 9:31; 21:24; 22:16; 24:44). It is used in Luke with the sense of "accomplish." The sense of "accomplish," pointing to a definite course or plan, is visible in 4:21; 9:31; 21:24; 22:16. In 1:20 it may mean that John is to be conceived "at the right time," so that the verse would underline John's role.

A surer reference is the reaction to John's birth in 1:66 (kai gar cheir kyriou ên met' autou). The phrase "the hand of the Lord" alludes to John's instrumentality in God's plan.[1] In Acts 4:28 (hosa hê cheir sou kai hê boulê proôrisen genesthai) the hand of God is equivalent to his boulê. There it is applied to the destiny of Jesus. In Acts 11:21 the cheir kyriou was with those who spoke to the Greeks. In 13:11 the "hand of the Lord" worked for Paul to blind Elymas. The "hand of the Lord" is the instrument of his will, and 1:66 brings John under its influence. At his birth the people's acclamation recognized him as an instrument of God.

Finally, 1:80 shows that John has an appointed place and time, and designates the object of his mission (kai ên en tais erêmois heôs hêmeras anadeixeôs autou pros ton Israêl).

---

[1]The phrase is peculiar to Luke in the New Testament.

This passage is the counterpart in John's story in 9:51 and Acts 2:1, both marking stages in the course of the history of salvation. Just as Jesus' way is determined by the "days of his Ascension," John's course is determined by the "day of his appearance." John's appearance to Israel (pros ton Israêl) is the real purpose of his life. Until then he is "in the deserts." In this light, the elaborate historical reference in 3:1-2 defines eschatological fulfillment precisely in John's "day."

Within a fundamental context of continuity, i.e., fulfillment of eschatological hope, Luke presents a sharply defined sequence: the time of John, concluding the era of Israel and preparing for the messianic Savior, and the time of Jesus, salvation personified. This discontinuity-within-continuity is exemplified in numerous ways,--in a distinction of "times," in a distinction of places, and finally in a distinction of messages. John preaches a baptism of repentance, whereas Jesus proclaims the Kingdom of God. Conzelmann rightly sees a certain continuity established in that the preaching of repentance is continued by Jesus.[1] Continuity is established also in the continuing mission of the Holy Spirit throughout the history of salvation, determining the role of John and of Jesus, each in its own way. Each fulfills God's promise to Israel, but the one is for the sake of the other. As Adolf Schlatter has phrased it: "Um des Christus willen wurde Johannes geboren . . . ."[2]

B. The Temporal Precedence of John and the Witness to Jesus

I In the Infancy stories Luke describes the relationship of John and Jesus in "parallel stories." Martin Dibelius has outlined this parallelism as follows:

---

[1]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 23. It also continues in the time of the church.

[2]Schlatter, Evangelium, p. 548.

1:5-25	1:26-38
1:39-56	
1:57-66	2:1-21
1:67-80	2:22-40
2:41-52[1]	

The narratives about John and Jesus correspond to one another, i.e., the Annunciation stories and the Birth stories are paired, and are linked together by 1:39-56.[2] In each case the story of John is told completely and separately from that of Jesus, but the corresponding story of Jesus immediately follows. This remains true in Luke's structure even beyond the Infancy narratives, for Luke removes any indication that the ministries of John and Jesus overlap. Thus, "the whole people" had been baptized before Jesus is mentioned. John could do no more: his work was finished. Thus we have the pattern: Annunciation of John--Annunciation of Jesus; Birth of John--Birth of Jesus; Ministry of John--Ministry of Jesus.

Two elements in the parallel presentation of John and Jesus stand out. John in all cases goes before Jesus. Not only is it the case that the stories of John are narrated first, but John comes first in time (1:26, 36, 56; 3:19-20, 21; cf. Acts 10:37; 13:24). The other element is that the focus of the stories always is on Jesus. The stories of John point to those of Jesus, and the descriptions of Jesus overshadow those of John. This is true even within the individual narratives. Individual statements about John and Jesus are often parallel, but those about Jesus are heightened.

On the latter point, numerous commentators have pointed out the heightening of the stories and statements about Jesus. Vielhauer, for example, notes that there is no parallel to the story of the twelve-year old Jesus and says that this gives greater importance to Jesus, and that the Infancy narrative is governed by the tendency to show the superiority of Jesus over John.[3] A. R. C. Leaney states that "Luke emphasizes

---

[1]Dibelius, Johannes dem Täufer, p. 67; see the description of Laurentin, Structure et Théologie, pp. 32-42.

[2]See Dibelius; cf. Vielhauer, "Benedictus," p. 255.

[3]Vielhauer, "Benedictus," p. 255.

both the importance of the rôle of John the Baptist in the divine plan and also its subordinate character."[1]

At the same time that Luke describes John and Jesus in parallel stories, he differentiates between the two. "L'analogie des formes met en relief le contraste des contenus."[2] The differentiation is made in the details of the stories as well as in statements about the significance and role of the two. For example, both John and Jesus are born of pious parents under extraordinary circumstances, and both are announced by Gabriel. But the circumstances differ in every detail. Both John and Jesus "shall be great." But their greatness differs--one is filled with the Holy Spirit from birth, the other conceived by the Holy Spirit--one is prophet of the Most High, the other Son of the Most High. Luke thus establishes the relation of John and Jesus in a two-fold way; through the structural parallelism of his description of their development, and through the differentiation he makes between them within that parallelism.

Two passages which deal with John and Jesus together rather than in alternation are the Visitation (1:39-45) and the Benedictus (1:67-79). The Visitation story serves both a literary and theological function, linking the two men.[3] John's role as a witness to Jesus is established, in a two-fold way. First, John's leap in his mother's womb (1:41) is a witness to the coming of the Stronger One. He is destined from birth (cf. 1:15) to point to the Lord. Secondly, Elizabeth's acknowledgment of Mary as "mother of my Lord" (1:43) establishes Jesus' identity as the kyrios before whom

---

[1]Leaney, Commentary, p. 41; cf. Benoit, "L'Enfance," p. 188; Tatum, "Epoch of Israel," p. 189; Oliver, "Lucan Birth Stories," pp. 213, 217f., 224.

[2]Laurentin, Structure et Théologie, p. 33.

[3]For the view that the Visitation story is a creation of Luke to bind together the birth stories, see M. Dibelius, "Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind. Untersuchungen zur Geburtsgeschichte Jesu im Lukas-Evangelium," Botschaft und Geschichte, Vol. I: Zur Evangelienforschung, ed. Günther Bornkamm (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1953), 13-14.

John must go (1:17, 76; 2:11; 3:3-4). The two mothers represent the future of their offspring. This story is the closest that John and Jesus come to an actual meeting in Luke, since the baptism of Jesus by John is not described in Luke. John's role is described as the forerunner of the Messiah, and he bears witness to the Messiah's coming (3:15ff.). It is not said that he knew Jesus to be that Messiah while he performed his ministry.[1] It is, however, finally John who first raises the question whether it is Jesus who is the Messiah (7:18ff.). Even then he has not met Jesus, but raises the question from prison, from hearsay.

Like the Visitation, "the Benedictus as it stands links together the mission of John and the mission of Jesus."[2] There have been numerous studies of the source, structure, and unity of the Benedictus, producing nearly as many theories and variations of theories as there are studies.[3] Within

---

[1]Cf. Easton, St. Luke, p. 13.

[2]Creed, St. Luke, p. 8.

[3]Many hold that the Benedictus is part of a Baptist document, e.g., Paul Winter, "The Proto-Source of Luke 1," NovT, I (1956), 184-199. Vielhauer ("Benedictus," p. 266) believes this, but thinks it comes separate from the Annunciation and Birth of John, and describes John as a messianic figure: "prophêtês hypsistou und anatolê ex hypsous sind zwei Titel derselben Gestalt, der erste charecterisiert sie hinsichtlich ihrer Aufgabe, der zweite hinsichtlich ihres Ranges." According to Vielhauer, the song celebrates the irruption of the Heilszeit in its first part (1:68-75), and the birth of John in the second (1:76-79)(p. 260). Benoit, on the other hand, believes the Benedictus is a very early Christian messianic hymn ("L'Enfance," p. 186), but he follows Dibelius in considering vss. 76-77 as an interpolation (p. 184; cf. Dibelius, Johannes dem Täufer, p. 74). On these two verses he says that "rien dans tout cela qui ne s'explique bien par l'activité litteraire de Luc" (p. 188). He believes that without vss. 76-77, which are the only reference to John, the song is structured by three strophes (vss. 68-71, 72-75, 78-79) of three distichs each (pp. 184-185). In another recent article, however, A. Vanhoye argues that the Benedictus is a unity as it now stands. His argument is also based on its structure, which, he maintains, is chiastic, NTS, XII (July, 1966), 382-389. Not all writers have concluded that the song is from a source prior to Luke, but, on the basis of language and style, a composition of Luke himself, e.g.,

the context the Benedictus responds to the birth of John the Baptist. Grundmann notes rightly that for Luke it deals with the unity between the Christ Jesus and his forerunner John,[1]

The Benedictus, inspired by the birth of John, immediately blesses God, proleptically, for the deliverance of Israel by its Messiah, here as yet unborn. The births of both John and Jesus are followed by responses praising God for deliverance and redemption. In 2:22-40 the joy of Simeon and Anna arises solely from the presence of Jesus. Zechariah's response to John's birth, however, is not directed solely to him, but begins with terminology (vss. 68-75) which is elsewhere used only of Jesus.[2] John's birth elicits response not for its own sake but as a sign which points forward to the Messiah. It is first the Deliverer who is praised, then the forerunner. John's greatness, which is reiterated in 1:66b consists of his witness to the Deliverer of 1:68-75. Zechariah blesses God for raising up a "horn of salvation" (keras sôtêrias, 1:69), and addresses John as the one who gives "knowledge of salvation" (gnôsin sôtêrias, 1:77). In 1:76, kyriou, while it might refer to "God" in isolation from the

---

Adolf Harnack, Luke the Physician, pp. 215-218; and "Das Magnificat der Elisabeth (Luk. 1.46-55) nebst einigen Bemerkungen zu Luk. 1 und 2," Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche, I: Zur neutestamentlichen Textkritik (Berlin und Leipzig; 1931), 62-85; H. J. Cadbury, Beginnings, Vol. V, p. 317, n. 1. It is evident that the problem of the Benedictus' source, structure, and unity have not been definitively solved.

[1] Grundmann, Evangelium, p. 70.

[2] Oliver regards vss. 67-75 as refering to John ("Lucan Birth Stories," p. 216). Neither John nor Jesus is mentioned by name in the Benedictus, but the references are clear by virtue of terminology related to that used elsewhere. In 1:76 paidion refers back to the question of 1:66a, i.e., to paidion. For Jesus, in vs. 69 salvation is raised up "in the house of David" (en oikô Dauid). Neither Zechariah nor Elizabeth is from the house of David (1:5-7), but Jesus is (1:27, 32ff.; 2:11). Similarly, the idea of visitation (1:68, 78b) occurs elsewhere only in relation to Jesus' ministry (cf. 19:44), and the term lytrôsin occurs again with reference to the presence of Jesus (2:38).

context, is thus made by Luke into a reference to Jesus (cf. 1:17; 1:43).[1] It would not be right, however, to conclude that the importance of John is de-emphasized here. Vielhauer is right to argue that Luke did not use the Benedictus simply as a corrective or for polemic. He wanted to describe John as forerunner of the Messiah, Jesus.[2] John's annunciation describes him as a forerunner; Jesus' describes him as Messiah. The Benedictus (and Visitation) relates them.

The factors at work in the Infancy narratives are maintained in Luke's treatment of John and Jesus in the Mark/"Q" traditions. John's ministry not only precedes that of Jesus, but is told completely (and as completed) before the story of Jesus' ministry is taken up. In Lk. 3 Jesus is mentioned by name (3:21) only after John's imprisonment is narrated (3:19-20) and after "the whole people" was baptized (3:21a). Then Jesus receives the Spirit (3:22). Thus Luke continues to keep John and Jesus adjacent but separate, the story of John again pointing forward to that of the Messiah. The climax in 3:21-22 concerns only Jesus' anointing and confirmation of his Sonship, but in 3:1-18 John had borne witness to his coming.[3] His testimony to the Stronger One (vss. 16ff.) is from the tradition, but the addition of vs. 15 makes it equivalently a messianic reference. As in the Infancy narratives, John goes before the Lord.

---

[1]Cf. Grundmann, Evangelium, p. 72: "Wie in 1,17 ist ho kyrios auf Gott zu beziehen und von Lukas auf Jesus bezogen."

[2]Vielhauer, "Benedictus," p. 269.

[3]Conzelmann, (Theology, p. 26) is too negative when he writes that "the exit of John has no particular significance, and we learn of his death incidentally in ix, 9." Luke not only narrates John's imprisonment, but in 3:21 notes that "the whole people" was baptized. In Acts 13:25 John is said to have "completed his course." John's exit marks the fulfillment of his task of preparation and thus also signals the time for Jesus to be anointed by the Spirit. For the same reason, W. C. Robinson, Jr. (Der Weg, p. 12f.) is wrong when he explains Luke's narration of John's exit in 3:19-20 as arising from his desire to end one story before beginning the next and that separation of John and Jesus is not intended.

Luke's use of the "Q" tradition in 7:18-35 is consistent with his presentation in 1:5-3:22. He retains the forerunner and preparer prophecies (Mal. 3:1; Isa. 40:3) already found in the pre-Lucan tradition (Mk. 1:2-3; Mt. 11:10). But 7;28 f. gives added impetus to the redactor's high evaluation of John's importance. He is indeed "more than a prophet."

Numerous critics have pointed out with reference to the Gattung "Gospel" that there is a "standard" framework adopted by all four Evangelists, one element of which is that "the Gospel" begins with John the Baptist. The early Christians evidently did not conceive of salvation as "doctrine" but rather as "event." Hence instruction quite naturally took the form of narrative and so the key question was not "what is the 'first principle' of salvation?" but rather, "where does the story begin?" J. M. Robinson asserts with reference to the "distinction of Jesus' ministry from previous Judaism" and the "distinction of Jesus' ministry from John's" that

> both motifs are sufficiently attested elsewhere in the New Testament (than in Mark's Gospel) to make it apparent that we have to do here with a topic of some theological importance for the early Church.[1]

The topic is certainly a conscious interest in Luke. The Lucan view is spelled out in Acts as well as in the gospel. Acts 13:24f. unequivocally specifies the temporal precedence and preparatory function of John:

> Before his coming John had preached a baptism of repentance to all the people of Israel. And as John was finishing his course, he said, "What do you suppose that I am? I am not he. No, but after me one is coming, the sandals of whose feet I am not worthy to untie." (RSV)

The notion of temporal precedence having been thoroughly established, the last text in Luke-Acts dealing with the Baptist merely reiterates John's witness to Jesus, here specifically proposed as a motive for the conversion to Christianity of certain disciples of the Baptist:

---

[1]J. M. Robinson, History in Mark, p. 22 (parenthesis mine).

> And Paul said, "John baptized with the baptism of repentance, telling the people to believe in the one who was to come after him, that is, Jesus." On hearing this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. (Acts 19:4-5; RSV)

There can be no reasonable doubt of the Lucan view: in the scheme of fulfillment John plays a pivotal role,--coming before Jesus and set off from him, he testifies to him and "prepares" his "way."

C. The Greatness of John and Jesus

Only John bears the title megas alongside of Jesus. In Acts, Simon the Magician (8:9, 10) and Artemis of the Ephesians (19:28, 35) are called "great," but both are put down. The phrase estai megas heads the parallel descriptions of the significance of the two men in 1:15-17 and 1:32-35. They are similar in their greatness, but also their greatness differs. While 1:32-35 is parallel to 1:15-17, it is also contrasting. The two are great, but they fulfill completely different sets of Old Testament hopes. John fulfills the Elijianic hope, Jesus the Messianic hope. John is filled by the Spirit in the womb, Jesus is conceived by the Spirit. John is the Prophet of the Most High, Jesus is the Son of the Most High. Yet even through the use of the title megas John and Jesus are apparently being related, for while it is said of Jesus that houtos estai megas,,John shall be megas enôpion kyriou. If Luke is here refering to Jesus by the title kyriou, as he does elsewhere, then John's greatness is being made relative to Jesus'. enôpion kyriou states the context within which John is Great, that is, his greatness is determined by his functioning in relation to Jesus, the Lord. H. H. Oliver, who stresses the apologetic interest of Luke in his treatment of John, misses the point when he writes that "greatest weight should be given to that position which sees in the term megas applied to Jesus and megas enôpion kyriou applied to John an intentional Lucan subordination of the latter to

the former.[1] The point of 1:15 is not to say that John is subordinate, but that John is great. The point of enôpion kyriou is that John's greatness is achieved within a definite context, his relation to Jesus. Anti-baptist apologetic is not the key to Luke's understanding of John.

1. Their Relation to the Heroes of Old

It is well known that the birth stories of John and Jesus in Luke have many parallels to the Old Testament birth stories of Isaac, Samson, and Samuel.[2] It is John especially who is related to these old heroes of Israel. Jesus, while his birth story follows the same pattern, is also related to the promise of a son in Isa. 7:14. Some parallels of the birth story of John to the birth stories of the Old Testament are as follows:

1:5		Jg. 13:2	I Sm. 1:1-2
1:6	cf. Gn. 17:1		
1:7	Gn. 11:30; 18:11[3]	Jg. 13:2	I Sm. 2:5
1:11		Jg. 13:3	I Sm. 1:27
1:13	Gn. 17:19; 21:3,4	Jg. 13:24	I Sm. 1:17,20
1:15		Jg. 13:4,14	I Sm. 1:11
1:16		Jg. 13:5b	
1:18	Gn. 15:8; 18:11		
1:25	Gn. 30:23; 21:6-7		I Sm. 1:11,20,27
1:36	Gn. 18:14; 21:7		
1:57		Jg. 13:24	I Sm. 1:20
1:58	Gn. 21:6		
1:59	Gn. 21:3,4		
1:63	Gn. 21:3,4	Jg. 13:24	I Sm. 1:20
1:80		Jg. 13:25	I Sm. 2:21

A list of parallels from the story of Jesus is shorter, but demonstrates the difference.

1:31	Gn. 17:19;16:11	Jg. 13:3,5		Isa. 7:14
1:46-55			I Sm. 2:1-10	
2:7			I Sm. 1:20	
2:12			I Sm. 2:34	Isa. 7:14
2:21	Gn. 21:3,4			
2:22ff.,39			I Sm. 2:18-21	
2:40,52			I Sm. 2:21,26	

---

[1]Oliver, "Lucan Birth Stories," p. 224, cf. p. 218.

[2]Benoit, "L'Enfance," pp. 177-178.

[3]Cf. Gen. 25:21 (Rebekah); 29:31 and 30:2 (Rachel).

John's birth is more closely related to the birth of Isaac to Abraham and Sarah at the beginnings of Israel, and to the birth of Samson. Jesus' birth has additional relationships to the birth of Samuel, but especially to the hope of a messianic son of David in Isa. 7:14.

The introduction in 1:5-7 already leads us back into Israel's past. The term steira is used in the LXX to describe Sarah (Gen. 11:30), Rebekah (Gen. 25:21), Rachel (Gen. 29:31), the wife of Manoah (Judg. 13:2, 3), and Hannah (ISam. 2:5).[1] The verb is also used of Rachel in Gen. 30:2.[2] The verb probainô is used of Abraham and Sarah (Gen. 18:11; cf. 24:1), so that each couple had their child in old age.[3] The introduction of Zechariah kai gynê autô recalls the introduction of Manoah and his wife in Judg. 13:2. The connections with the Samson story continue (as listed above).[4] The same is also true of the stories of Isaac.

Luke's Gospel begins with the traditional theme of piety and barrenness. The two aspects of the theme are in tension with each other, but also point ahead to the fulfillment of the promise of blessing. The beginning of the Annunciation of John's birth (vss. 5-7) stands in contrast to the ending (vss. 24-25). God vindicates the righteous. The conception of John is set in this theme of promise and fulfillment like one of the heroes of old. The element of tragedy is present in all of these birth stories, since fruitfulness is a blessing of God and there was to be no barrenness where the covenant was kept (Ex. 23:26; Deut. 7:14). The overcoming of

---

[1]Also Ex. 23:26; Deut. 7:14; Job 24:21; Ps. 112(113):9; Wisd. 3:13; Isa. 54:1; 66:9.

[2]In the sense, as often, of "withhold" or "deprive," esp. of Yahweh's withholding of something.

[3]Elsewhere probainô is used of declining heroes; Abraham, Joshua, David, Eleazar. Benoit, "L'Enfance," p. 177, refers to the Isaac story as the most important model. Also, Zechariah's response in 1:18 is most like that of Abraham and Sarah, in Gen. 15:8.

[4]In Judg. 13, however, the angel appears to the woman, as to Mary, and it is she who must avoid wine and strong drink.

barrenness, however, was considered to be a great act of God (Ps. 113:9). In Isa. 54:1; 66:9 barranness is a metaphor for Exilic Zion. These passages express the hope for new fruitfulness. The birth of John to a barren mother is a sign of hope for God's restoration of Israel. John's birth thus designates him as next in a series of heroes of Israel.

The connection of John to the old order is shown also in that "he will not drink wine or strong drink" (1:15; cf. 7:33). This classes him as like a Nazirite (cf. Num. 6:3). He is also like the prophets, especially Jeremiah.[1] John is consistently associated only with Israel in Luke's gospel and Acts, and his ministry is limited to the preparation of Israel or "the people" This is first stated in 1:16, 17, but reiterated in 1:77; 3:15, 18, 21; 7:29; Acts 13:24. The only possible exception would be the "soldiers" in 3:14.

Jesus' birth announcement in 1:26-37 and the birth story of 2:1-7 is parallel to that of John and purposely developed alongside of it. At the same time it is parallel to the same stories from the Old Testament as that of John. But Jesus' relation to the birth stories of old differs from John's in its connection with the promised birth of Immanuel, Isa. 7:14. While John's birth is like that of the men of old of the past in Israel's history, Jesus' birth belongs to Israel's hope for the future birth of a new David (1:32). A new era begins with Jesus (3:23), while John is the last of the men of God. of Israel (7:28; 16:16). John is the greatest of the men of Israel's history because of his preparation of a "readied people" (1:17; cf. 3:21a; 7:29; Acts 13:24) before the messianic age.

---

[1] 1:15b; 3:2. Lampe, "Holy Spirit," p. 166, also tries to draw John closer to Samuel: "Like Samuel, he is the agent by whom, though in a very different manner, the Davidic and Messianic king is anointed; thus his action recalls the account of Samuel that is given in Ecclus. 46:13." But in Luke John is not the agent of Jesus' anointing at all. Lk. 3:21-22 is not a Baptism story. Jesus' reception of the Spirit takes place after "the whole people" and Jesus had been baptized. Luke also deletes Mark's reference to "coming up out of the water" (Mk. 1:10).

2. Their Relation to the Holy Spirit

In the parallel statements of the significance of John and Jesus in 1:15-17 and 1:32-35 the Holy Spirit is described as operative in their births. In both cases the Holy Spirit's work determines the character of the one to be born. But his activity differs in each case. John is to be "filled with the Holy Spirit from his mother's womb" (kai pneumatos hagiou plêsthêsetai eti ek koilias mêtros autou, 1:15). Jesus will be conceived by the virgin because the "Holy Spirit will come upon" her (pneuma hagion epeleusetai epi se, 1:35).

A number of studies have been made of the role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts. Still important is that of Heinrich von Baer. The Holy Spirit was a leitmotif for the whole work of Luke.[1] The time after Pentecost, in Luke's structure of Heilsgeschichte, is the real Epoch of the Spirit. "Als Voraussetzung knüpft er an das A.T. an und schildert dann das Wirken Gottes in den zwei Heilsepochen, der des Sohnes und des Heiligen Geistes."[2] But the Spirit is active in all periods of history: in the Old Testament as the Spirit of prophecy; then as the Spirit of the Son of God as he rested on the earthly Jesus; and finally as the Spirit of the Exalted Lord, who worked in the community of disciples after Pentecost. "Als Träger des Heilsplanes Gottes in der Geschichte weitet Lukas den Heiligen Geist, der in verschiedenster Gestalt, sich in den Gottesmännern vorkörpernd, wirkt."[3] In 1:15-17 the Spirit of prophecy is at work in the last and greatest of the prophets. The old Heilsepoche had reached its aim and high point in the Baptist.[4] In 1:35 the Spirit works in a new way. "Dieser neue Zustrom des Geistes bedingt auch für den Verfasser den Anfang der neuen Epoche, in der der Geist Gottes als Wesen des Gottessohnes in dieser Welt erscheint."[5] In

---

[1]Heinrich von Baer, Der Heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1926), 2.

[2]Ibid., p. 45. [3]Ibid. [4]Ibid., p. 47.

[5]Ibid., pp. 48-49. von Baer also shows that the use of the Holy Spirit concept in the Infancy narratives is characteristic of Luke and not of the Old Testament (p. 54).

3:22 the Spirit-baptism of Jesus marks the beginning of the new time.[1] This messianic Spirit is the key theme at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, based on Isa. 61:1ff. "Die Voraussetzung zu der öffentlichen messianischen Wirksamkeit bildet das Ruhen des Heiligen Geistes auf Jesus."[2]

A more recent study is that of G. W. H. Lampe.[3] His conclusions about the holy Spirit as operative on John and Jesus are much the same as von Baer's and do not go beyond the earlier study. "A most striking feature of the opening chapters of St. Luke's work is the outburst of the prophetic Spirit which forms the setting of the Forerunner's birth and mission and of the birth and infancy of Jesus."[4] "John represents the old dispensation, as the last and greatest of the Hebrew prophets. In Jesus the Spirit is operative in a new way, . . ."[5]

The Holy Spirit is related to both John and Jesus, but to each in a different way, and Tatum rightly says that "the status of John or Jesus is determined by his own peculiar relationship with God's Spirit."[6] John will be "filled with the Holy Spirit" (1:15). This distinction is shared by John with others, but it is only he who is filled "from his mother's womb." It was shown above that the phrase "filled with the Holy Spirit" is Lucan and that it occurs only before and after the ministry of Jesus. This filling with the Spirit gives

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 55, 61f.

[2] Ibid., p. 62. von Baer thought that the connection was broken by Luke by the insertion of the Genealogy between 3:22 and 4:1 (p. 68): "Welche Absicht Lukas veranlasst haben mag, gerade an dieser Stelle die Genealogie einzufügen, ist nicht mit Sicherheit festzustellen." But von Baer failed to discern the structure of Luke's gospel and to see that the Genealogy stands at the beginning of Jesus' ministry, and therefore of the new "Epoch."

[3] G. W. H. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke," Studies in the Gospels, ed. D. E. Nineham (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957), 159-200.

[4] Ibid., p. 165. [5] Ibid., p. 167.

[6] Tatum, "Epoch of Israel," p. 187.

rise to prophecy. John, however, being filled with the Spirit from his mother's womb,-is a "born prophet." That is the identity and task set for him to fulfill. It is even said that John grew and became strong "by the Spirit" (1:80). Thus, John, like Jeremiah, was destined to be a prophet (Jer. 1:4-5). The statement "from his mother's womb" is demonstrated by John's role in the Visitation. John's leap in her womb was the sign that the "mother of her Lord" was present. Even as an unborn babe John runs before Jesus and bears witness to him.

As with John, the Holy Spirit is operative in the birth of Jesus. The operation differs, however, so that their identity is determined differently. John is born a prophet; Jesus is born Son of God. In 1:35 the angel answers Mary's question with the parallel lines: "The Holy Spirit shall come upon you, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow you" (pneuma hagion epeleusetai epi se, kai dynamis hypsistou episkiasei soi). This is stated as the cause of the effect which follows (dio kai to gennômenon hagion klêthêsetai huios theou).[1] The concepts of "Spirit" and "power" are parallel and used synonymously here. The power of God is operative with the presence of the Spirit.[2] Luke elsewhere associates the Holy Spirit and power. The effect of the Holy Spirit's activity is to give power (cf. 4:14; 24:49; Acts 1:8; 10:38). This takes place at important events in the history of salvation, especially Jesus' anointing, the beginning of Jesus' ministry, and Pentecost.[3] The Holy Spirit is the power which

---

[1]Cf. Legrand, "L'arrière-plan," p. 164. He also demonstrates that the whole of 1:35 bears the mark of Luke's style (p. 163).

[2]Cf. Tatum, "Epoch of Israel," p. 187; Creed, St. Luke, p. 20.

[3]See Conzelmann, Theology, p. 183; Legrand, "L'arrière-plan," p. 164. "Spirit" and "power" also are used of John in 1:17, but in a way without parallel. Here the phrase associates John with the function of Elijah. Conzelmann, Theology, p. 183, n. 2, has written that both 1:17 and 1:35 "represent a special case of the use of 'Spirit' and 'power'." Actually only 1:17 differs. In 1:35 "power" is still the power of God effective through the Spirit as elsewhere in Luke.

determines Jesus' messianic identity as Son of God.[1] This is true at the end of Luke's first section, in 3:22. This verse is Jesus' messianic anointing in fulfillment of Isa. 61:1ff. (cf. 4:18). At this point also his Sonship is confirmed by the voice from heaven.[2] From this point on until Pentecost the Spirit is operative only on Jesus.[3] Jesus' anointing ends the period of the Spirit's activity as prophetic Spirit of Israel, which was last effective in John the Baptist, and begins the time of the Messiah. The borderline between the times is thus marked by Jesus' reception of the Spirit (3:23). Before that the work of preparation was done by the man whom the Holy Spirit "filled from his mother's womb." "And it is precisely the activity of God's Spirit that sets them apart. This is one of the crucial contributions of the Spirit-motif in Luke i-ii."[4]

3. Their Relation to the Most High

The Holy Spirit was operative on both John and Jesus and determined their identity and function. The identity of each also consists of a peculiar relationship to the "Most High."[5] In 1:32 Jesus "shall be called Son of the Most High" (huios hypsistou klêthêsetai). In the parallel, 1:15-17, John is given a prophetic function, but in 1:76 Zechariah says "you shall be called Prophet of the Most High" (prophêtês hypsistou klêthêsê). John and Jesus are related as Prophet and Son of God.

The prophetic character of John is preserved by Luke throughout his work. In 1:15-17 his being filled with the

---

[1]Tatum, "Epoch of Israel," p. 190.

[2]Cf. Legrand, "L'arrière-plan," p. 166.

[3]Grundmann, Evangelium, p. 26.

[4]Tatum, "Epoch of Israel," p. 189.

[5]An expression most used by Luke in the New Testament (Mt. 21:9; Mk. 5:7; 11:10; Lk. 1:32, 35, 76; 2:14; 8:28; 19:38; Acts 7:48; 16:17; Heb. 7:1).

Holy Spirit identifies him with the prophetic office.[1] That he was filled from the womb, and that his function was one of "turning," are reminders of Jeremiah. Similarly, in 3:2 the introduction "the word of God came to John the son of Zechariah" recalls the opening of Jeremiah (1:1 LXX).[2] But the functions listed in 1:15-17; 1:76-77 identify John with the prophet of Israel's hope, the eschatological prophet associated with Elijah (cf. Joel 2:28; I Macc. 4:46; 14:41; Ps. 74:9; Mal. 3:1; 3:23), and with the preparer of Isa. 40:3. The conception of John, and then of Jesus, brings about the restoration of prophecy to Israel (1:41ff.; 1:67ff.; 2:25ff.). The description of John in 1:16-17 identifies him as the one who goes before the Lord and prepares for the Lord. The explicit reference to the "spirit and power of Elijah" makes John the eschatological prophet. The prophecies of Malachi and Isaiah 40 also determine the description in 1:76-77.

John's identity as the prophet is worked out in Ch. 3 by his appearance as a baptizer (3:3-6), his preaching of repentance (3:7-9), his ethical teaching (3:10-14), and witness to the coming of the Messiah (3:15-18). In 7:24-30 he is a prophet, but more than a prophet (7:26); he is identified with the forerunner of Mal. 3:1 (7:27). Because he is more than a prophet, i.e., the forerunner, he is the greatest of those born of women (7:28). Conzelmann claims that Luke suppresses the forerunner role. John is last and greatest prophet, but not forerunner. "The apocalyptic idea of the forerunner is eliminated. Luke tries to see John in the line of all the other prophets. He stands before Jesus as the last of the prophets, not as an authentic eschatological figure."[3] Even if we were to exclude Lk. 1-2 there would be no basis for this conclusion, since Luke accepts the view of the tradition in Ch. 7. John not only is greatest of the prophets, he is

---

[1]For the "prophetic" characteristics of these verses, see Benoit, "L'Enfance," p. 180; Laurentin, Structure et Théologie, p. 111.

[2]Cf. Benoit, "L'Enfance," p. 180.

[3]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 101.

"more than a prophet" bacause he is the forerunner. It is for this reason that the people justify God (7:29, Lucan!).

That John is "last" of the prophets must also be qualified.[1] Luke also uses "prophet" as a description of Jesus, more than either Mark or Matthew (4:24; 7:16, 39; 13:33; 24:19; Acts 3:22, 23; 7:37; cf. Lk. 11:47-50; 13:34; Acts 7:52). Jesus, however, is not identified with the eschatological prophet of Israel, but is identified as a prophet particularly inasmuch as he shares the fate of the prophets. Like Elijah and Elisha he does not limit himself to Israel (4:25-30). John, however, is the prophet of Israel's eschatological hope and has a mission to Israel. He closes Israel's role in the history of salvation and is thus the last prophet of Israel. After his mission is accomplished a new era begins with the anointing of Jesus.

The sonship of Jesus is a theme which runs throughout Luke's first section culminating with the voice from heaven at his anointing. Then his ministry is headed by the Geneaology which also goes back to "God" (3:23-38). In 1:26-31, 32-35 Jesus' Sonship to God is two-fold. He is Son of God by virtue of being the promised son from the Davidic house (1:26). Verses 31-35 reflect the Davidic hope expressed in Isa. 7:14; 9:5-6; IISam. 7:12-16 (cf. Ps. 2:7; Ps. Sol. 17:21, 32, 37; Dan. 7:14). Lk. 1:32-35 is structured as an inclusion formed by klêthêsetai.

1:32a	His Name and Nature
1:32b	His Rank
1:33	His Function and Destiny
1:34	Mary's Question
1:35a	His Origin
1:35b	His Name and Nature

Davidic elements included in these verses are "the throne of David" (1:32); "rule" (1:33); "house of Jacob" (1:33); "forever--Kingdom without end" (1:33); "son of God" (1:32, 35). Luke maintains this Davidic identity throughout the Infancy Narratives and elsewhere (1:69; 2:4, 11, 26; Acts 13:23; cf.

---

[1]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 25; von Baer, Heilige Geist, pp. 45ff.; Lampe, "Holy Spirit," p. 167.

Acts 3:13, 26 with Lk. 1:69b). Jesus thus fulfills the messianic hope of Israel, as John fulfills the prophetic hope.

Jesus is also Son of God by virtue of his conception by the Holy Spirit. The dio of 1:35b refers back to Gabriel's answer to Mary in 1:35a.[1] The two parts of the verse together make up the response to 1:34. Thus God himself brought about the birth of Jesus through the Spirit, and for that reason Jesus is Son of God.[2]

The Sonship of Jesus is at issue also in 2:41-52. In this story Jesus dissociates himself from his parents (2:43b, 48, 49a, 50) and states his own identity and destiny (2:49). Jesus' Sonship is finally confirmed at the end of Luke's first section, 3:22. Once again Spirit and Sonship are related. The Holy Spirit anoints Jesus as Messiah (Isa. 61:1ff.; Lk. 4:18) because he is the Son of God. As in Mark, unlike in Matthew, the voice of confirmation is directed to Jesus privately, so that his office as Messiah is affirmed to him only. It is the signal for him to begin (3:23).[3] In 9:34, at the

---

[1]The future tense, klêthêsetai, might be pushed as a reference to 3:22, so Ferdinand Hahn, Christologische Hoheitstitel (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963), 318: "Das klêthêsetai huios theou 1,35 bekommt damit einen im Gesamtrahmen sehr präzisen Sinn, indem es auf das Taufgeschehen verweist."

[2]Jesus as "Son of God" receives its greatest emphasis in Chs. 1-4 of Luke, but it is by no means lacking in the rest (after 3:22, cf. 3:38; 4:4, 9, 41; 8:28; 9:35; 22:70; Acts 8:37, but with textual difficulties; 9:20; 13:33). The connection with his birth, however, is missing elsewhere. Conzelmann uses this fact to support his non-use of Chs. 1-2, (Theology, p. 172, n. 1): "Neither Luke xxii, 70 nor Acts xiii, 33 makes any mention of a connection between Jesus' status and his birth. Cf. on the other hand the emphasis on dio in Luke i, 35." This is a tenuous argument, since in neither case does the context give any reason for mention of Jesus' birth.

[3]Commentators have not arrived at a consensus on whether Lk. 3:22 follows the Marcan text or cites Ps. 2:7. The Marcan form has stronger textual support. Also the citation of Ps. 2:7, with its emphasis on sêmeron, is in tension with Luke's earlier passage in 1:32-35. In Acts 13:33, moreover, Ps. 2:7 is associated with the Resurrection. All three points, Birth, Spirit anointing, and Resurrection become pointers to Jesus' Sonship in Luke-Acts. Cf. Grundmann, Evangelium, p. 27.

climax of the first stage of his ministry, his office is affirmed to the disciples. The whole opening of Luke's gospel, 1:5-3:22, with its alternation between John and Jesus, emphasis on the fulfillment of Israel's hopes, and John's preparation of the "whole people," focuses on this one verse, 3:22, in which the Messiah is commissioned. The eschatological prophet has done his job; the new era of the time of salvation begins.

The Infancy narratives and 3:1-22 are built on the theme of the fulfillment of the promises of redemption, told in terms of the nationalistic hope for Israel's freedom. The deliverance is to be brought by the awaited Davidic Messiah/Son of God, whose birth is now proclaimed. This national hope is expressed in 1:32-35; 1:68-75; 2:9-11; 2:25-26; 2:29-32, 38. In two passages this hope goes beyond a sheer nationalistic one--Simeon's Song, 2:32, and the extension of the Isa. 40 quotation, 3:6. Together with this hope is the expectation of a new Prophet. Here the Messenger is set alongside of the Davidic Messiah and is made to be the messenger, not of Yahweh, but of the Messiah--that is, the Messiah's forerunner. This is expressed in 1:15-17; 1:76-77. The first statement of the meaning of John is in 1:15-17, the first about Jesus is 1:32-35; each is in an Annunciation. The two passages correspond in function and are both parallel and contrasting. Each tells about the role of its subject in terms of the Old Testament promises. Their roles, however, are much different. Each begins with a similar acclamation (megas), but their greatness differs. The two statements taken together point forward to the end of Luke's first section. John the forerunner and preparer does perform these roles (3:1-20), and Jesus, who shall be called Son of God, is indeed so called (3:21-22).

The greatness of John does not lie in the literary quality of his prophecy. He has left no body of polished oracles. His demands of Israel had a purity and simplicity that set him apart from the religious elite of his time. In

the conscious urgency of his task, he set no premium on ritual purity nor on any special interpretation of the Torah. Now, at the final hour, only one thing was needed: a change of heart. Judgment was at the gates, and salvation the gift of one Stronger than himself. His greatness lay in his witness to the Savior.

D. The Function of the Forerunner

In the preceding three sections it was shown how Luke treats John the Baptist as a figure called to fulfill a pivotal and decisive role in the Plan of God. He is great because he fulfills the eschatological prophecies of a forerunner and preparer; great because he bears witness to the coming of the Christ and salvation; great because he prepares a "readied people" for messianic salvation. In this section his function according to Luke will be examined in more detail.

1. Terms describing John's Work

The first statement of John's significance is 1:15-17, and three verbs state his work and establish the direction for the whole story of John in Luke. One verb defines John's role as one who "turns" (epistrepsai) people. He will turn the "sons of Israel to the Lord their God," the "hearts of fathers to their children," and the "disobedient to the mind of the Just." He functions strictly in relation to Israel. The "turning" is the work of John as the Malachian forerunner. In 1:17 the "turning" is dependent on the main verb proeleusetai. The verb hetoimazô connects John with both the Malachian and Isaian work of preparer. He will prepare a "readied people for the Lord." This, too, is dependent on proeleusetai. The most general statement of John's function, therefore, is in the verb proeleusetai. John will go before "him" (vs. 17) = "Lord God" (vs. 16). in order to do the work of "turning" and "preparing." The passage taken alone refers to John as forerunner of God, but Jesus becomes the Lord in the following

development of the gospel. The apparently redundant prefix pro- with enôpion specifies John's time and ascribes both temporal and functional precedence to John. The themes which emerge, thus, are used to show John's relation to Jesus. He is the advance, God's prologue, who goes before the Messiah and makes the people ready. Ultimately, everything points to the "beginning" (3:23) of Jesus, who is the "Lord" (1:43; 2:11).

The general function of "going before" is reiterated by Luke, and the prefix pro- is characteristic.[1] The idea of John as forerunner pervades Luke's presentation of him. It defines his person. In 1:17 proeleusetai is a fairly unique usage, being found only here with reference to John. The verb can mean "go forward," or "move on" (Mt. 26:39; Mk. 14:35; Acts 12:10, 13), but also "go, or arrive, ahead of someone" (Mk. 6:33; II Cor. 9:5; of Judas in Lk. 22:47; cf. Acts 20:5, 13). Here John is he who arrives ahead of the Lord as his advance.

In 1:76 proporeusê is used in the same way as proeleusetai in 1:17. This verb is used elsewhere only in Acts 7:40, again in the sense of "go ahead of." It too is used relative to enôpion and specifies temporal precedence, and like proeleusetai in 1:17, it is the main verb in its sentence. The character of John's "going ahead of" the Lord is again defined by a series of dependent infinitives. In Acts 13:24 John's character as Jesus' advance and his specific function are combined in the verb prokêryxantos, which occurs only here in the New Testament. John's preaching "beforehand" puts further emphasis on his work "before" Jesus' "entrance" (eisodos).

That John's advance character refers to his identity as forerunner is confirmed by 7:26-30. In view of the use of Mal. 3:1 in the following verse, vs. 26 (perissoteron

---

[1]See Conzelmann, Theology, p. 151; also n. 1.

prophêtou) can refer only to the forerunner.[1] Luke's redaction in no way denigrates the forerunner role here, as Conzelmann supposes.[2] Conzelmann recognizes the temporal precedence of John in Luke's gospel, but will not apply it to the forerunner concept because of its eschatological connection. He points to the omission of opisô mou in Lk. 3:16 as an avoidance of the forerunner idea.[3] Robinson's view that opisô mou was dropped because of its implication of discipleship may be the better conclusion.[4] In any case Luke maintains the "after me" statement in Acts 13:25 with a change to met' eme (also 19:4; cf. 10:37). That he did not supply met' eme in Lk. 3:16 would simply be due to the fact that it was unnecessary. Conzelmann instead refers to John as "last and greatest of the prophets" of the previous epoch.[5] Luke certainly does believe that John is the greatest prophet before Jesus (1:15, 76; 7:28). But that is not the point he sets out to make. Rather, John is the greatest prophet because he is "more than a prophet." At this point Luke is in full accord with the "Q" tradition.

The purpose of John as forerunner is as preparer, which is stated at the beginning in 1:17 (hetoimasai kyriô laon

---

[1]Cf. Easton, St. Luke, p. 101; Creed, St. Luke, p. 107; Grundmann, Evangelium, p. 165, who writes: "Er ist nicht ein Prophet, sondern er ist der verheissene Prophet, der dem Kommen des Heilbringers vorausgeht."

[2]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 25. [3]Ibid., p. 24.

[4]W. C. Robinson, Jr., Der Weg, p. 20; cf. Joh. Schneider, ThDNT, II, p. 669 and n. 18. Robinson believes this is due to anti-Baptist apologetic. In a similar way Oliver, "Lucan Birth Stories," p. 217, states that "it is quite probable that prophêtês and proporeusê, like proeleusetai in i,17, are deliberate choices of Luke to establish the subordinate and preliminary role of John to that of Jesus and the Middle of Time." It is true that John is "preliminary." But that Luke is interested in showing that John is subordinate is questionable. For a Christian writer it goes without saying that John is "subordinate" to Jesus, and he could present him in no other way. But Luke's description of John's person and role is in every way positive. It is John's importance that is stressed.

[5]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 25. Cf. von Baer, Heilige Geist, pp. 45-47; Wilckens, Missionsreden, p. 103.

kateskeuasmenon).[1] A "readied people" is the object of his work, that is, ready for the one who is to come after him (and hence for salvation). But the theme is also provided in the citation of Isa. 40:3 in 3:4. Preparation is for the Way of the Lord. In Luke as a whole, hetoimasô is used primarily with reference to Jesus' way.[2] John prepares people (1:17), and the Lord's way (1:76; 3:4; cf. 7:27). The coming of the Lord and the coming of salvation correspond, so that Simeon's reference to Isa. 40:5 in 2:30 is followed by reference to God's "preparation." In the gospel, Jesus' way is prepared in 9:51ff. by messengers. Other preparations are for the Passover (22:8, 9, 12, 13), spices for burial (23:56; 24:1), and in Jesus' parables (12:20, 47; 17:18). In 7:27 kataskeuazô is used in the citation of Mal. 3:1.[3] Lk. 7:27-30 may be related to 1:17 where John is to "prepare a readied people." "All the people" and "tax-collectors" justify God after Jesus' witness to John because they had been baptized by him. Luke had already noted that "all the people" was baptized (3:21), though not their leaders.[4] Moreover, Luke's redaction states that it was "the crowd" (3:7, 10) and then "the people" (3:15, 18) with whom John had worked (cf. 1:77). Since John was to prepare a "readied people" Luke presents John as having completely fulfilled his task of preparation. This was before Jesus entered.[5] When "all the people" are baptized, then Jesus is named and the Spirit descends on him. As in 1:76; 3:4 it is the Lord's way which is prepared. The precedence of the preparation is noted in the words emprosthen sou meaning "before you" in the sense of "ahead of." This is

---

[1]Cf. Tatum, "Epoch of Israel," p. 194.

[2]The verb occurs only once in Acts, 23:23.

[3]The only context in which it is used in the Synoptics.

[4]Cf. Conzelmann, Theology, p. 24.

[5]Cf. the statement of Wilckens, Missionsreden, p. 102, on the emphasis on proclamation "beforehand": "Damit aber wird der Täufer in der heilsgeschichtlichen Funktion dargestellt, die nach Lukas den Propheten zukommt: auf Jesus hin vorauszuverkündigen. Dem entspricht auch, dass Johannes „dem ganzen Volk Israel" verkündigt."

shared with Matthew against Mark, but accented by Luke in his redaction. At any rate, the preparation had been done when Luke told the story of John's imprisonment (3:19-20). Luke feels it no longer necessary to stress the aim of preparation in references to John in Acts.[1]

The specific means of preparation is expressed by a variety of terms throughout Luke-Acts. In 1:16, 17 John's work is described by the verb epistrepsai. Verse 16 identifies the objects of his "turning" to God as "sons of Israel." This may be compared to 1:17, where he must prepare a "readied people" and 1:77, where he must give knowledge of salvation to "his people." As it turns out in Luke's telling of the story, this is accomplished when "all the people" are baptized (cf. "all Israel," Acts 13:24). John's ministry never extends beyond the "sons of Israel." The story of salvation begins with Israel and the forerunner of its Messiah. The effect of vs. 17, "to turn hearts of fathers to children" (from Mal. 3:23) and "the disobedient to the mind of the just," is to give definition to the statement of vs. 16, so that "turning" is understood to be a basic change of attitude. It is the attitude which alone will win the acquittal of Israel before the tribunal of God on the day of judgment.

epistrepsai is a word used technically by Luke.[2] In Acts 3:19; 26:20 it is used as a couplet with metanoeô (repent and turn).[3] Conzelmann, on the basis of Acts 26:20, distinguishes the two concepts, "repentance" (metanoia) refering to a change of mind and "conversion" (epistrepsai) refering to a change of conduct.[4] The line of distinction can only be a fine one if it even exits. The secondary clause "doing works worthy of

---

[1]But F.F. Bruce (Acts, p. 354) comments thus an Acts 19:4: "Note how hina, instead of being at the beginning of the clause, is joined immediately to the verb; this construction throws ton erchomenon met' auton into prominence, thus stressing the preparatory nature of John's ministry."

[2]Altogether it occurs seven times in Luke, eleven in Acts.

[3]Cf. Lk. 17:3.

[4]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 100. He refers also to Acts 3:19.

repentance" connects conduct with repentance, but also refers back to the whole double clause. The phrase in 1:17 uses epistrepsai in a sense closer to Conzelmann's view of "repentance." Moreover, they are used interchangeably with reference to an orientation toward God. In part the choice of words depends on the audience. There is a preference in Acts for the phrase "turn to the Lord/God" (epi kyrion/theon) with reference to the Gentiles (9:35; 11:21; 14:15; 15:19; 26:28), while "repentance" is used for both Jews and Gentiles. In Acts 26:20 both Jews and Gentiles had been named preceding the use of the couplet "repent and turn to God." Acts 3:19 uses epistrepsai for Jews, but lacks epi theon/kyrion. Lk. 1:16 is the exception to the general rule. In Lk. 17:3-4 metanoeô and epistrepsai are used as synonyms. It seems more likely that the couplet in Acts 26:20 should be understood as a hendiadys. Conzelmann is right that the concept metanoia is narrowed in Luke-Acts, that "repentance becomes the act of repentance."[1] The fruits of repentance must follow. Conzelmann notes that in Acts 26:20 "the works (N.B. plural in Luke iii,8) which follow upon 'repentance' must now be emphasized separately."[2] This is just as true of "turning to God," to which the clause on doing "worthy works" is also subordinate. "Turning to the Lord" is a Lucan ideal which equals "repentance." Acts 26:20, with its reference to "turning" and "worthy works," also provides a link between Lk. 1:16 and the description of John's ministry in Ch. 3. It is his function to "turn sons of Israel to the Lord their God." In 3:8 he calls for "fruits worthy of repentance" (where the plural is used like Acts 26:20, but unlike Mt. 3:8). John's preaching is like that of Christian preachers in its call for repentance and the doing of worthy works. "Turning" is also a function of the prophets,[3] with whom John is identified, and may be one of a series of connections of John with Jeremiah.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 99, n. 3. [2] Ibid., p. 100.

[3] For the prophetic function of repentance, cf. Jer. 3:7, 10, 14; 18:8; Ezek. 3:19; Dan. 9:13.

In 1:77 the mode of preparation is expressed in the words "to give knowledge of salvation (tou dounai gnôsin sôtêrias) to his people." To Luke the coming of salvation corresponds to the coming of the Messiah, and it is John's role as the Messiah's forerunner to make known that way of salvation.[1] sôtêria is used only by Luke among the Synoptics,[2] three times in the Benedictus, and in 19:9 when Jesus enters the house of Zacchaeus. In the Benedictus, in the first part of the song, Zechariah blesses God for raising up "a horn of salvation in the house of his servant David," which in the context can only refer to Jesus. The address to John in 1:76, 77 makes John the advance witness to the "horn of salvation." In Acts "salvation" continues to be associated with the coming of Jesus in Christian preaching. In Acts 13:26, Paul's reference to "the word of this salvation" (ho logos tês sôtêrias tautês) follows immediately upon his recital of John's course of preaching and Jesus' "entrance" (13:24-25). It refers to the coming of the Savior, Jesus, before whom John preached "a baptism of repentance"to all the people of Israel." Luke's own understanding is expressed also in Acts 4:12, kai ouk estin en allô oudeni hê sôtêria. John is the first witness to his coming to Israel. The giving of knowledge is clarified in 1:77b by the phrase en aphesei hamartiôn autôn. Forgiveness of sins becomes the means of giving knowledge. Luke here points forward to the traditional work of John of "preaching a baptism of repentance for forgiveness of sins" (3:3). The whole concept of aphesis is common in Luke who uses it ten times as compared to seven in the rest of the New Testament. Eight of these are the fuller phrase aphesis hamartiôn (Lk. 1:77; 3:3; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 5:31; 10:43; 13:38; 26:18).[3] Its usage is technical and is found with "repentance" (3:3; 24:47; Acts 2:38; 5:31) or "turning" (Acts 26:18) as the condition

---

[1]Cf. Laurentin, Structure et Théologie, p. 126.

[2]It occurs once in John, 4:22.

[3]The other two occurrences are in Lk. 4:18, a citation from Isaiah.

for forgiveness.[1] It is associated with baptism (3:3; Acts 2:38), the name of Jesus (24:47; Acts 2:38; 10:43; cf. 13:38, "through this man") and is an object of preaching (3:3; 24:47; Acts 13:38; cf. 2:38; 10:42). Acts 2:38 is the fullest expression of an economy of salvation, where all these themes are brought together, with the promise "you will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Just as John is like the Christian preachers of Acts (and Jesus, cf. Lk. 5:32) in calling for repentance, so the object of repentance is the same for both, forgiveness of sins. The coming of salvation is that which gives rise to the call for repentance for both John and Christian preachers.

The point of distinction between John and the Christian preachers of Acts lies in Luke's understanding of Baptism. John preached a "baptism of repentance" (3:3; Acts 13:24; 18:25; 19:4) which is otherwise identified as "the baptism of John" (Lk. 7:29; 20:4; Acts 1:22; 10:37; 19:3).[2] It is true that both call for repentance as a condition, and both offerforgiveness of sins. But Christian baptism is not only a "baptism of repentance." It is also baptism "in the name of the Lord Jesus." A point is made of this distinction in Acts 19:3-5 but compare 2:38 (Luke's full expression); 8:12, 16; 10:48; 22:16. Acts 19:4 points to a further distinction by its back reference to Lk. 3:16, where the passage continues with the traditional statement about baptism by the Holy Spirit and fire. Luke makes a point of distinction in Acts 1:5; 11:16 where baptism by water and by Spirit are set over against each other. Acts 1:5 says no more about John than that he baptized with water, and the contrast is drawn with the imminant baptism by the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, which marks the beginning of the new era of the church and becomes

---

[1]Paul Schubert points out that "repentance" and "forgiveness" are closely linked in Acts, in "The Final Cycle of Speeches in the Book of Acts," JBL, LXXXVII (March, 1968), 15.

[2]With the exception of Lk. 12:50 the noun "baptism" is used only to refer to the baptism of John. Christian baptism is refered to only by the verb.

the decisive characteristic of the new movement.[1] Luke depicts the Holy Spirit as operating in connection with baptism, but not as bound to it (Acts 8:16; 10;47; 11:15). The use of the Lord's word about the distinction (Acts 1:5) in 11:16 arises from an instance when the Holy Spirit came independently of water as a sign that repentance is also granted to the Gentiles (11:18).[2] The distinction between John and the Christian preachers, therefore, is determined entirely by their temporal position relative to Jesus, that is, to the coming of salvation. But it is still a message relative to salvation and the Messiah's coming. That is why Luke can add that John was "evangelizing" the people (3:18).

Luke does not make it a point to describe John's baptizing activity as such, and it is not mentioned in the Infancy narratives. In Ch. 3 people come to him for baptism, but the emphasis falls on his preaching! In 7:29-30, the baptism of the people marks their acceptance of his preaching in advance of the Messiah. In 3:21 the baptism of all the people marks the completion of his course (cf. Acts 13:24). Similarly, in Acts 1:22 the baptism of John is the point of departure for Jesus' "going in" and "going out". The baptism of the people, therefore, is the sign that the work of preparation has been done. When all the people have been baptized the Spirit descends on Jesus (3:21-22). Jesus' baptism has become unimportant in Luke because it is the Spirit's action and the preparation of the people that count.

Luke emphasizes John as a preacher rather than as a baptizer, but his preaching is fulfilled by the baptism of the people.[3] In Acts 10:37 Jesus appears "after the baptism which John preached" (to baptisma ho ekêryxen Iôannês). Baptism is stressed here as the object of John's preaching, and hence as the proper response to it. It stands for the

---

[1]Cf. Conzelmann, Apostelgeschichte, p. 22.

[2]John, of course, preached only to Israel (Lk. 1:16; Acts 13:24); but it was "all" Israel.

[3]Cf. Wilckens, Missionsreden, p. 101.

acceptance of his message of repentance. The same is true of Acts 13:24, where before Jesus' eisodos John prokêryxantos . . . baptismatmetanoias. It specifies not only John's temporal precedence, but also the nature of the baptism he preached (3:3; Acts 19:4). The aim of his preaching of repentance is baptism. Baptism is maintained by Luke as the proper response to John's preaching. It is the mark of repentance, and hence of preparation. Here also the preaching is directed to "all Israel" (cf. Lk. 1:17, 76-77; 3:16ff., 21; Acts 19:4).

The picture of John's function as drawn fromLLk. 1:16-17, 76-77; 7:24-30, and the passages in Acts is entirely consistent with Luke's presentation of his activity in 3:1-20. He appears "preaching a baptism of repentance for forgiveness of sins" (3:3). This, without the actual description of baptizing activity, emphasizes the preaching and its aim to produce repentance, the condition of forgiveness.[1] In 3:7-9, the "crowds came out to be baptized," but it is John's preaching which is presented by Luke. The warning to do "worthy fruits of repentance" is followed up by Luke's insertion of vss. 10-14 with specific ethical instructions as examples of worthy fruits for those with a change of heart.[2] The question ti poiêsômen is the same asked in Acts 2:37, after which Peter recites the necessary response to those who were "cut to the heart." Verses 16-17 are Marcan, but placed in the context of messianic questioning (vs. 15), so that the saying about the Stronger One becomes a specific messianic witness. With verses 19-20 John is out of the picture. At this point he has "gone before" and "preached before" Jesus. Verse 21 puts Jesus' baptism into the background, but "all the people" are

---

[1]Cf. Conzelmann, Theology, p. 102.

[2]Conzelmann notes a threefold pattern in John's preaching which corresponds to a common primitive Christian pattern: the threat of judgment; the challenge to repent and be converted; and exhortation (Theology, pp. 26, 102). His teaching "is directed to conversion, baptism and exhortation" (p. 102). I hold, however, that his distinction between repentance and conversion is overdrawn.

noted to have been baptized. The people, hence, have been "made ready" (cf. 1:17) for the coming of the Lord. The baptism of John is the sign of preparation.[1] John's identity is that of forerunner of the Lord and as such he has the function of preparing the way of the Lord, which means preparing the people. The task of preparation is done specifically by the preaching of repentance, the offering of forgiveness, ethical instruction, and baptism. The basis for preparation is the coming of the Stronger One with whom comes salvation.

Conzelmann argues that the preaching of repentance is John's real task, and it is that which persists into the new epoch and is continued by Jesus. "It is John's role to prepare the way for this by preaching and baptism . . . ."[2] His preaching of repentance is valued "not because it is a sign, but because of its content."[3] It is John's ministry rather than his person that is preparation for Jesus.[4] Conzelmann undervalues the significance of John is Luke's presentation. His denial of John's person as an element of preparation arises from his denial that John is the forerunner. But the person of John is important for the same reason as the person of Jesus. Each is the fulfillment of an old hope, the one of the Messiah, the other of the forerunner. As Luke presents his material it is because of who John is that he does what he does. Moreover, John's work does have a sign value. It is true that the preaching of repentance continues on into Jesus' ministry, and that of the church of Acts. The sign value lies in the accomplishment

---

[1]On this point, note that 3:7, 12 refer to 7:29-30; 3:16 refers to Acts 1:5; 11:16; 18:25; 19:1-7; and 3:21 refers to 20:1-8; Acts 1:21-22; 10:37; 13:24. Conzelmann writes that Jesus is baptized as one of the people, but that Luke does not suggeststhat John plays an important role in it (Theology, p. 21). The first point is true, but the second misses the point. The fact of Jesus' baptism is no longer what the story is about in Lk. 3:21-22.

[2]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 23.

[3]Ibid., p. 23, n. 1. [4]Ibid., p. 24.

of baptism, which is the response to repentance and the mark of preparation.

Conzelmann undervalues John even further. With the baptism described as a baptism of repentance, Conzelmann writes that the emphasis is not on an advance over earlier times, but "on how it falls short compared with Christian baptism with the Spirit."[1] He points to the recurring references to this problem in Acts 1:5; 11:16; 18:24-19:7. This, he says, is part of Luke's apologetic which shows John is subordinate to Jesus just as is the whole epoch of the Law.[2] This emphasis is suspect. Acts 1:5 has the character of promise (vs. 4), not apologetic, and points forward to the Day of Pentecost which inaugurates the new era of the Spirit. John did not baptize with the Spirit, not because he was subordinate to Jesus, but because it was not yet the time. The relation of John and Jesus is not in question here. The same is true of Acts 11:16. The context shows that apologetic against John is not in question for Luke, but recognition that the promise of the Spirit is fulfilled and extends to the Gentiles.[3] The stories in 18:24-19:7 may have an apologetic intention,[4] but even then it is not at the expense of John himself, but against Baptist followers who have not recognized what John himself predicted, viz., that one would come after him (19:4). The effect is not John's subordination, but that the Spirit is now active (which John also predicted, 3:16). That John is lesser than Jesus Luke would hold, since

---

[1]Ibid., pp. 24, 102.

[2]Ibid., pp. 24-25. Cf. F. J. Foakes-Jackson, The Acts of the Apostles (New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1931), 3; "Luke . . . is careful to mention the connexion between the Baptist and Jesus, and to contrast the baptism of John with that of the Spirit."

[3]Taken in isolation this saying might have an apologetic purpose, but Luke is not using it in isolation.

[4]E.g., Ernst Käsemann, "The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus," Essays on New Testament Themes ("Studies in Biblical Theology 41"; London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1964), 136-148; also Conzelmann, Apostelgeschichte, p. 110; Haenchen, Apostelgeschichte, pp. 489-492.

it is true of anyone. That is not a point he needs to make. On the other hand, in relation to Jesus he maintains John's greatness.

Conzelmann rightly says that "John's preaching as a whole provides the basis for the preaching of the 'Gospel', of the 'Kingdom of God'."[1] This, he adds, shows both the connection and distinction between the two epochs. But he further states that the phrase kêryssôn baptisma metanoias "indicates the distance from Christian Baptism, which includes forgiveness."[2] That is not a distinction Luke makes. He maintains the Marcan eis aphesin hamartiôn (3:3) and includes the task of "forgiveness" in 1:77, so that John's baptism also includes forgiveness. The only distinction notable is that the baptism of Acts is now in the name of Jesus and associated with the outpouring of the Spirit. The difference between John's preaching, baptism, and witness and that of the Christian preachers is due to their time-relation to Jesus.[3]

2. John as Witness to the Coming of the Messiah

In discussing the threat of judgment by John in 3:7-9, which is then followed by ethical teaching (3:10-14) and the reference to the Stronger One (3:15ff.), Conzelmann notes that the threat of judgment and the time of judgment are separated in Luke's conception. "John does not declare that judgement is near, but that the Messiah is near . . . ."[4] In fact, the whole of 1:5-3:22 tells of the coming of the Messiah/Son of God and the concomitant coming of salvation, climaxing with the descent of the Spirit when all the people are baptized. John precedes Jesus throughout to bear witness to his coming. John is entirely separated from Jesus in outward aspects of

---

[1]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 102.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Also in that the Christian preachers know Jesus to be the Messiah, which was not yet apparent for John.

[4]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 102.

his work, in geography and in time. John is in no way depicted as knowing that it is Jesus who is the Stronger One. The baptism of Jesus is not presented as have independent significance, but he is baptized as one of the people. Jesus is not even mentioned in the description of John's ministry (3:1-20), but only after the preparation is completed (3:21).

In spite of this discontinuity, the whole life and purpose of John is so closely related to Jesus' coming that John has no significance apart from it. It is his destiny to point forward to the one who is coming. Every story of John is succeeded by a story of the Stronger One. John is Great before the Lord--but not without Jesus. In spite of the separation, John and Jesus presuppose one another. Continuity is provided through the Mal. 3 and Isa. 40 prophecies, which are fulfilled by both men. John is to Jesus what the preparer is to the revelation of salvation and the forerunner is to the Lord. All of his work bears witness to Jesus' coming as the Messiah. Thus John is the opposite number of the Christian preachers of Acts. While they look <u>backward</u> to salvation and call for repentance and baptism, John looks <u>forward</u> to salvation and calls for repentance and baptism. Jesus is the middle factor. John is filled with the Spirit from his mother's womb to proclaim salvation in advance. He is the sign that the promises are being fulfilled.

John does not entirely wait until he is grown to perform his function. His first witness to Jesus is a premature kick (1:41). In the story of John's birth, the Song of Zechariah which responds to it sings not to John but to the "horn of salvation" (1:69). Within the song the child is mentioned as his prophet. The mother and father of John are "filled with the Holy Spirit" (1:41; 1:67) to speak in his stead of the coming Lord. In the ministry of John the question concerning <u>ho Christos</u> becomes inevitable, and John's witness to his coming becomes his last act, for which his whole ministry of repentance and baptism is geared. It is no surprise, then, that it is John who first raises the messianic question about

Jesus specifically, 7:18-23. It was his task to prepare a "readied people"; now he recognizes the messianic character of Jesus' ministry. The revelation of salvation is taking place.

E. The Preacher of Christ and Salvation

In his opening section,,1:5-3:22, Luke gives the initial expression and development of some of his major concerns, which will be carried out in the whole of Luke-Acts. The opening chapters are not a prefix isolated from the whole, but launch a continuous and unified work. Within the first section the ministry of John the Baptist in Ch. 3 also expresses some of Luke's major concerns. These are the setting of the events of redemption within the context of world history (3:1-2), the coming of the Christ (3:15-18) and of salvation (3:3-6), and responsive life in the world (3:7-14). In what follows is a summary of how the issues expressed in the ministry of John are related to the first section as a whole and to the whole of Luke-Acts.

Though he does not use the word "history" Luke deals with his subjects in terms of their temporal connections and relationships and describes them as they develop and extend in time. At the very beginning of his work he locates his story in both general and specific historical settings. The Infancy narratives are set in historical context: "the days of Herod, King of Judea" (1:5). Thus the Annunciation of the births of John and Jesus and the birth of John are placed in the history of Israel. Jesus' birth, however, is also rooted in Roman history, that is, in the reign of Caesar Augustus, when Quirinius took a census (2:1-2), though Jesus emerges from the "house and lineage of David" (2:4). From the start Luke thus invests the Messiah of Israel with a significance that is universal.

The context of world history is also stated in the introduction to the ministry of John. In 3:1-2 John's "day of

appearance to Israel" (1:80) is given a historical setting within both the history of Rome and of Israel. Here the dating is more specific,--the "fifteenth year of the reign of Tiberias Caesar" (3:1). The events which follow have their link with Israel's history, because they speak to the hope of Israel, but now the whole world is involved in the judgment and salvation which John will announce.[1] Verses 1-2, which include direct reference to John, are a single sentence, so that they date John specifically. Jesus is indirectly dated also, however, since he follows John immediately.[2] Luke thus takes the fifteenth year of the Roman emperor's reign as the point which marks the beginning of the fulfillment of Israel's prophecies. John himself, in fulfilling his role, calls attention to the focal points of the hopes yet to be fulfilled,--the coming of the Christ (3:15-18) and of salvation (3:4-6).

Two concerns are already evident: the ongoing character of history, and the universal significance of the events which now emerge from the history of Israel. Flender sums up a general consensus of scholarship when he states that Luke proves "to be a theologian of the post-apostolic age."[3] Conzelmann has cogently argued that Luke is a third generation Christian, dating his work at about the turn of the second century.[4] Luke knew the time of Jesus, the apostles, and Paul to belong to the past, and that his own time for all appearances would extend into the future indefinitely. Moreover,

---

[1]Flender, St. Luke, p. 115.

[2]Ibid., pp. 115, 122f.

[3]Ibid., p. 1. I prefer, with Flender, the description "post-apostolic" to "early catholic." "Post-apostolic" simply places Luke into a historical framework as a rough contemporary with those whom we call the "Apostolic (post-apostolic) Fathers" and begs less questions. "Early Catholic" tends to carry a negative value judgment. For defense of the latter expression, however, see Ernst Käsemann, "Paul and Nascent Catholicism," Journal for Theology and the Church, III (1967), 14-15.

[4]Hans Conzelmann, "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity," Studies in Luke-Acts, ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), 298-316.

Jerusalem was dead and gone, the church and Judaism were separated entities, and the church itself increasingly a Gentile institution. Since Christianity was an institution in world history, and the Parousia was in the indefinite future, Luke had to interpret Christianity in the context of the continuity of history, but it is a history eschatologized. History becomes important as the arena in which the events of eschatological salvation take place. Luke attempts to show that, though the end of time is defered, salvation is a present, attainable reality, that Christian life is a possibility and responsibility.

The deferment of the End, reflected in John's ethical teaching, is clearly expressed in Luke and Acts and presupposed by the open-ended conclusion to which Luke leads his whole work. In 19:11-27 the Parable of the Pounds is told by Jesus in response to the supposition that "the Kingdom of God was about to appear immediately" (19:11). Instead of that, however, the "nobleman" would be gone to receive a kingdom (19:12). In the meantime, his servants would have to make use of the pounds which were given them (19:13). Acts 1:6 is comparable to Lk. 19:11, but 1:7 states the indefiniteness of the end, while the disciples receive a commission for action in the time between Ascension and Parousia.[1] Nevertheless, the suddenness of the end is emphasized, as well as its universal character (Lk. 21:34-36), so that the note of urgency in view of the prospect of judgment remains (cf. Lk. 12:40; 17:20-21, 26-30; 3:7-14).

For Luke, therefore, the events of salvation, the coming of the Christ, and the response of men are eschatological events taking place in the course of history. He does not give a general theology of history. The history he writes is specifically a history of salvation which takes place according to the Plan of God. It happens in correlation with secular history, and reveals the real and final meaning of it. Within

---

[1]See Flender, St. Luke, pp. 76-77; Conzelmann, Theology, p. 121.

the ongoing movement of history salvation takes place as a continuous movement, a movement articulated by decisive events and turning points. The discontinuity and continuity which is evident in the relationship of John and Jesus is indicative of the way Luke structures his history throughout.

We have discussed the elements of continuity and of discontinuity between John and Jesus. The story of Jesus is itself bounded, and thus set apart from both preceding and succeeding times, by his eisodos (Acts 13:24) and his exodos (Lk. 9:31).[1] The outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost corresponds to the anointing of Jesus, the Parousia corresponds to Jesus' Ascension.[2] In this way the time of Jesus and the following time of the church are made to be formally analogous periods. The early church is set apart from Jesus, just as is John the Baptist. But as John looked forward to the Christ, the church looked back to the Christ, and both receive their meaning from the Christ. Both have similar tasks in the light of the coming of the Christ--the call to repentance, baptism, and change to a new life. The new factors in Acts are the "name of Jesus" and the constant action of the Spirit. The discontinuity in the movement of this history is thus caused by the descent of the Spirit at Jesus' anointing and at Pentecost (3:22; Acts 2:1ff.).

The continuity of the history of salvation, however, is clearly evident in the various motifs of movement which are present throughout Luke-Acts and the goals of the movement which are reached in stages, in fulfillment of prophecy. It was previously shown how Isa. 40:3-5 provides Luke with a rationale for his whole work and how Luke-Acts begins with Israel and ends with the Gentiles. The whole work moves from the one to the other, step by step. In the gospel Jerusalem becomes the goal of movement. First, Jesus must move among the cities of Judea to preach the Kingdom of God (4:43-44).

---

[1]Cf. Talbert, "Anti-Gnostic Tendency," pp. 264-265, 269.

[2]For the relation of Ascension and Parousia, see Flender, St. Luke, pp. 91ff.; Conzelmann, Theology, p. 204.

Then the "days of his Ascension" begin and he must go to Jerusalem where he accomplishes his "exodus" (9:31; 9:51). Each section of Jesus' ministry, as we saw in the treatment of Luke's structure, sets the stage for the next. The same is true of Acts. There the church moves out from Jerusalem (Acts 1:8) and Rome becomes the goal of Paul's ministry (Acts 19:21). The movement of salvation from Israel to the Gentiles is a continuous one, but determined by a series of climactic events which act as turning points. The movement of the history of salvation hinges on these: the anointing of Jesus (3:22), the Transfiguration (9:18-36), the arrival at Jerusalem (19:28-46), the Ascension (Acts 1:1-11); Pentecost (Acts 2:1ff.), the Martyrdom of Stephen (Acts 7:54-8:3), the Conversion of Cornelius (Acts 11:18), the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15:1-35), the arrival of Paul at Rome (Acts 28:23-31). In all of this the Plan of God takes effect as it was made known in Scripture.

Acts 28 does not represent the last word, though it concludes Luke's literary work. The history of salvation will finally close at the Parousia, the defered end of time. Though Luke is concerned for the presence of Christ and salvation and life in this world, the ultimate goal will be the Parousia (Acts 1:11; 3:20-21). This event remains before the world as the last event of judgment and redemption (Lk. 21:38; 34-36). Luke nevertheless makes use of traditional eschatological events in his theological structure which maintain their decisive character, that is, they are indispensable for the accomplishment of salvation. They are precisely those events which Luke understands to have interjected new phases into history, to have altered the course of events. Both the anointing of Jesus and the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost are fulfillments of the eschatological hopes of Israel, as are the forerunning of John and the Resurrection/Ascension of Jesus. It is these events which shatter history and bring about the new in Luke's theology and which make salvation possible, since the coming and presence of salvation is in

Luke's view a concomitant of the coming and presence of the Messiah. It is not so much that Luke has replaced eschatology with a scheme of history, but that the eschatological events take place in the course of history, changing it and giving it a structure. It has lost its apocalyptic character. The decisive redemptive events have been merged with the course of history, but are none the less decisive.

Another of the major concerns of Luke which emerge in the ministry of John is that for the presence of Christ and salvation. John is presented as a preacher of the Christ with whom comes the prospect of salvation for "all flesh" (3:3-6, 15-18). It is in the light of the coming of Christ and salvation that John calls for repentance (3:3) and the fruits of repentance (3:7-14). In all of this, as we have seen, John is like the Christian preachers of Acts. Another aspect of Luke's concern is involved in the fact that at the same time John proclaims the coming of the Messiah of Israel he also announces salvation for "all flesh." The problem is that of the Jewish rejection of the Christ and the Gentile make-up of the church. Here, alongside of John, Simeon becomes the spokesman and themesetter for the development of Luke-Acts. In his blessing of God (2:29-32) he says that salvation is prepared "for all peoples," a "light for revelation to the Gentiles, and glory for your people Israel." He says more, however, While he knows "peace" because he has seen God's salvation (2:29-30), in his prophecy to Mary he says that Jesus will cause the "fall and rising of many in Israel" and be a "contradicted sign" (2:34).

These three aspects of Luke's theology, therefore, already are present in his opening section in the words of Simeon: the presence of salvation comes with the presence of Christ; Jesus is both the Messiah of Israel and a light for the Gentiles; Jesus is the bringer of both division and peace. It is beyond the scope of this study to trace the development of all of these aspects. More can be said about the first as it relates to John and the rest of Luke-Acts. As already noted, John

noted, John preaches repentance and offers forgiveness of sins in the light of the coming of the Christ and salvation and offers baptism as a mark of repentance. Insofar as he does these things he performs the same function as the Christian preachers of Acts. It is the differences between John's and the Christian preachers' ministries that reflects Luke's thinking about the presence of salvation during the time between the Ascension and Parousia, while Jesus is exalted in heaven. In exhortations in Acts two additional elements are present which are unnecessary for John. These are expressed in Acts 2:38. "Repent, and be baptized each of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for forgiveness of your sins, and receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." The availability of salvation is connected with the name of Jesus and the gift of the Spirit.[1] Luke had a rationale for this in his Pentecost quotation from Joel 3:1-5. This quotation begins with the pouring out of the Spirit on all flesh in the last days, but its last line, too, is important. "And it shall be that all who call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Acts 2:21).

In Acts 3 and 4 the "name of Jesus" is the power for both healing and salvation. In 3:6 Peter heals a lame man "in the name of Jesus Christ." This is reiterated in 3:16 and 4:10 (cf. 4:30). Acts 3:16 adds the requirement of faith. Acts 4:10 virtually identifies the "name of Jesus Christ" with the person Jesus (en tô onomati Iêsou Christou, . . en toutô . . . ; cf. 13:38), so that his "name" stands for his presence. In 4:9 the verb sesôtai is used for "healing" so that the act of healing by Jesus' name becomes a paradigm for salvation.[2] The whole story thus leads to the doctrine expressed in 4:12,

---

[1]Cf. Flender, St. Luke, pp. 135ff.

[2]Luke has already done this in the Gospel, also in connection with "faith"; see 7:50; 8:48; 17:19; 18:42. Both Lk. 7 and 8 are important for the connection of "faith" and "salvation. "Faith" plays a role similar to "repentance," but they are not identified. Repentance is directed to God, faith is in Jesus Christ, cf. Acts 20:21.

that salvation is by the "name" of Jesus. As in the Gospel it is the presence of Christ which makes salvation possible. That the exaltation of Jesus serves the possibility of salvation to Israel, at least, is expressed in Acts 5:31.[1]

Both of these additional elements, the Holy Spirit and the name of Jesus, are present in the text on the baptism of John in Acts 19:1-7. John's baptism was connected with the coming of Jesus (19:4). These twelve disciples, however, were not baptized in the light of Jesus' coming. Therefore they needed to be baptized "in the name of Jesus" (19:5). This story does not, therefore, negate John's baptism *per se*, but emphasizes the necessity of the connection of baptism with Jesus. In John's own time "the name of Jesus" was unnecessary because Jesus was about to be present as a man among men. In either case, it was in the light of Jesus' coming that baptism was performed. Luke has done as much as possible, it seems, to claim John for Christianity, as forerunner.

Finally, another concern of Luke which finds expression in the ministry of John is the necessity to live and be at home in the world. John thus appears as an ethical teacher (3:7-14).[2] The necessary condition for the appropriation of salvation is repentance (3:3; 5:32; 15:7, 10; Acts 2:38 *et al*). The peculiar material Lk. 13:1-9 shows the urgency of this repentance. But beyond that it is necessary to call for "fruits worthy of repentance" (3:8). The plural "fruits" distinguishes the Lucan text from Mt. 3:8, and links it with the similar text of Acts 26:20 where Paul says those who repent

---

[1] For other uses of the "name of Jesus", see Acts 4:7, 17, 18; 5:28, 40, 41; 8:12, 16; 9:14, 15, 16, 21, 27, 28; 10:43 (cf. 13:38), 48; 15:26; 16:18; 19:13, 17; 21:13; 22:16; 26:9.

[2] Cf. Conzelmann, Theology, p. 231, n. 4: "The influence of Luke's ethical leanings can be seen as early as in the account of John the Baptist, where Luke creates a pattern of ethical exhortation by introducing the account of John's preaching. Already it is taken for granted that the world will continue."

and turn to God should "do works worthy of repentance" (cf. Lk. 6:43ff.; 8:15). John's teaching in 3:10-14 gives three specific examples of ethical responsibility in response to the three-fold ti poiêsômen (3:10, 12, 14; cf. Acts 2:37). The three examples have to do with acts of mercy and honesty in everyday life.[1] It is difficult to determine whether Luke intended a contrast to be apparent between the ethical demands of John and those of Jesus. Lk. 3:11 might be contrasted with 6:29 to show that the demand of Jesus is more radical than that of John. Yet there is not enough material to be sure that such a distinction was part of Luke's intention. The situations in 3:11 and 6:29 are not altogether the same. More important for Luke's own situation than the apparent contrast between the teaching of John and Jesus is the need for positive ethical instruction in the light of repentance. Conzelmann has noted in Lk. 3 a pattern of preaching used elsewhere in Luke-Acts,--threat of judgment, challenge to repentance, and exhortation.[2] Even for John's ministry the question is important: How shall the repentant person live in the world?

Many of the passages in Luke's gospel, especially in the Travel narrative, apply to the believer's response to life in the world.[3] His instruction touches on a broad range of concerns. A reading of Luke's ethical passages shows that the thoroughgoing character of Jesus' ethics has in no way been attenuated. Luke makes it clear that the doing of duty is an insufficient basis for the fulfillment of Christian responsibility (17:7-10). One must go as far with mercy and forgiveness as does God himself (6:36; 17:3-4). Care and

---

[1]Cf. Grundmann, Evangelium, p. 104: "Die Frucht der Umkehr besteht in gütigem und gerechtem Handeln in der konkreten Situation des jeweiligen Lebens und Berufes." Cf. also Flender, St. Luke, p. 85.

[2]Conzelmann, Theology, p. 102.

[3]See Bo Reicke, "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," in Studia Evangelica, 206-216; Flender, St. Luke, pp. 73ff.

responsibility for the neighbor and the disabled must be given in the same terms as Jesus gave (10:25ff.; 14:12-14, 21). One ought not to be overcome by anxiety for life (10:38-42; 12:31ff.), and the greater one's wealth and possessions are the greater is his responsibility also (12:13-21, 48; 16:1-9, 10-15, 19-31; 19:11-27). The Christian will also remain diligent in hearing and keeping the word of God (8:11-15; 10:38-42; 11:27-28) and humble prayer (11:1ff.; 18:1-8, 9-14). The urgency of all this is in the necessity and unexpectedness of judgment (cf. 3:7-9; 12:35-40; 17:22-37; 21:34-36).[1] Luke calls for renunciation (14:33) and knows the danger of temptation (8:13; 22:39-46) and of "suffering dishonor for the name" (Acts 5:41), but presents in general a positive view of life in the world and history.

Both Schubert and Minear have noted the importance of prophecy and fulfillment in the Lucan Infancy stories.[2] Their point is certainly applicable to the whole of 1:5-3:22. The purpose of this opening part of the gospel is to announce the fulfillment of Israel's eschatological hopes. This fulfillment centers upon the two figures John and Jesus, the forerunner and the Messiah--twin foci of the opening chapters. All other characters react to the appearance of these two men, and in so doing give hints of the direction which Luke takes in the rest of his story of Luke-Acts.

The one figure, John the Baptist, fulfills Israel's hope for a forerunner. Though not identified as Elijah redivivus, he nevertheless is like Elijah and fulfills the function of Elijah foretold in Malachi. John's purpose is most succinctly stated in 1:17, "to prepare for the Lord a

---

[1]Cf. Conzelmann, Theology, p. 232: "The Judgement still remains a motif, no longer on account of its proximity, but because it is a fact. The real problems which are treated first and foremost are those which arise from the situation of the Church in the continuing life of the world."

[2]Schubert, "Luke 24," p. 178; Minear, "Birth Stories," p. 119.

readied people." In Luke's view "the Lord" is Jesus. He fulfills Israel's hope for a Messiah, a new David, with whom comes salvation and deliverance. The stories of these two figures are told separately and in parallel. In each case John's story bears witness to the one who is to follow him and could not stand alone. Jesus is made the central figure, the completion of hope for those "awaiting the consolation of Israel" and "the redemption of Jerusalem." It is John's purpose in the Plan of God to prepare his way. Finally, in the ministry of John, through witness to the coming of the Messiah and salvation and through the preaching of repentance and good works, he prepares a readied people and the way of the Lord is prepared. Thus Luke's announcement of the fulfillment of Israel's hopes reaches its culmination at the anointing of the Messiah in 3:22. A new era begins with the ministry of Jesus and Israel's history of promise and hope is completed. All the characters of the first section are representative of Israel and her hope. John's ministry is directed to Israel. He completes her history by preparing a readied people for Messiah and salvation. John himself is the beginning of eschatological fulfillment; yet the time of messianic salvation is inaugurated by the anointing of Jesus.

Luke uses both the elements of continuity and discontinuity to express the relationship of John and Jesus. The discontinuity, the separation, expresses the shift from the old to the new, from Israel's waiting for salvation to salvation's presence. The continuity, the juxtaposition, expresses the fulfillment of prophecy together with the dependence of John for his meaning on the coming of the Christ and hence the centrality of Jesus.

The preaching of Good News is begun with the appearance of the angel to the shepherds (2:10). In the Birth story of Jesus the shepherds "praise" and "glorify" God (2:13, 20). And if the Good News is the coming of Jesus, John is his herald <u>par excellence</u>. Israel's long history of waiting is an empty shell without the coming of the Christ; without him

John's ministry would be pointless. If he is no "reed shaken by the wind" it is because he is Christ's supreme witness before an Israel in expectation. Neither reed nor king, but a prophet, John points to the goal of history. The old has no meaning without the new; with the new it is charged with meaning. The last of the prophets is the first to proclaim the presence of Christ. The proper response to his ministry is to accept his witness, like the disciples who "when they heard, were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus" (Acts 19:5).

Bibliography

A. Commentaries

Bruce, F. F. The Acts of the Apostles. Chicago and Toronto: The Inter-Varsity Christian Fellowship, 1952.

Conzelmann, Hans. Die Apostelgeschichte. Vol. VII of Handbuch zum Neuen Testament. Edited by Günther Bornkamm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1963.

Creed, John Martin. The Gospel according to St. Luke. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1960 (1930).

Easton, Burton Scott. The Gospel according to St. Luke. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J. The Acts of the Apostles. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1931.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J., and Lake, Kirsopp (eds.). The Beginnings of Christianity. Pt. I: The Acts of the Apostles. Vol. IV: English Translation and Commentary. Vol. V: Additional Notes to the Commentary. Edited by Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury. London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1933.

Gilmour, S. Maclean. The Gospel according to St. Luke. In Vol. VIII of The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick, et al. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1952.

Grundmann, Walter. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. Vol. III of Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament. 2nd ed. Berlin: Evangelisshe Verlagsanstalt, 1961.

Haenchen, Ernst. Die Apostelgeschichte. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Dritte Abteilung, 14. Auflage. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.

Lagrange, M.-J. Évangile selon Saint Luc. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1927.

Leaney, A. R. C. A Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke. New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1958.

Loisy, Alfred. L'Évangile selon Luc. Paris: Émile Nourry, Éditeur, 1924.

Macgregor, G. H. C. The Acts of the Apostles. In Vol. IX of The Interpreter's Bible. Edited by George A. Buttrick, et al. New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1954.

Manson, William. The Gospel of Luke. New York: Richard R. Smith, Inc., 1930.

Munck, Johannes. The Acts of the Apostles. Revised by W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann. Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1967.

Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke. 5th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1922.

Schlatter, Adolf. Das Evangelium des Lukas. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1960.

Williams, C. S. C. A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1957.

B. Books

Baer, Heinrich von. Der Heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag, 1926.

Bardy, Gustave, et al. Élie le prophète. Vol. I: Selon les écritures et les traditions chrétiennes. Les études carmélitaines. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1956.

Bultmann, Rudolf. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Translated by John Marsh. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963.

_____. Theology of the New Testament. 2 vols. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

Cadbury, Henry J. The Making of Luke-Acts. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1927.

_____. The Style and Literary Method of Luke. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920.

Conzelmann, Hans. The Theology of St. Luke. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1960.

Dibelius, Martin. Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums. 4th ed. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1961.

_____. Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. Edited by Heinrich Greeven. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1956.

_____. Die Urchristliche Uberlieferung von Johannes dem Täufer. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1911.

Erdmann, G. Die Vorgeschichte des Lukas und Matthäusevangelium und Vergils vierte Ekloge. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1932.

Flender, Helmut. St. Luke: Theologian of Redemptive History. Translated by Reginald H. and Ilse Fuller. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1967.

Hahn, Ferdinand. Christologische Hoheitstitel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.

Hawkins, John C. Horae Synopticae. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1899.

Jeremias, Joachim. Jesus als Weltvollender ("Beiträge zur Forderung christlicher Theologie 33"). Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1930.

Kraeling, Carl H. John the Baptist. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1951.

Laurentin, René. Structure et Théologie de Luc I-II. Paris: Librairie Lecoffre, 1957.

Meyer, Eduard. Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums. 3 vols. 4th & 5th eds. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellsahaft, 1962 (1924).

Morgenthaler, Robert. Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis. 2 vols. Zürich: Zwingli Verlag, 1949.

_____. Statistik des neutestamentlichen Wortschatzes. Zürich-Frankfurt am Main: Gotthelf-Verlag, 1958.

Norden, Eduard. Agnostos Theos. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1956 (1912).

O'Neill, J. C. The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting. London: S.P.C.K., 1961.

Robinson, James M. The Problem of History in Mark ("Studies in Biblical Theology 21"). London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1957.

Robinson, W. C., Jr. Der Weg des Herrn. Studien zur Geschichte und Eschatologie im Lukas-Evangelium. Hamburg-Bergstedt: Herbert Reich-Evangelischer Verlag, 1964.

Sahlin, Harald. Der Messias und das Gottesvolk.. Uppsala: Almquist & Wiksells Boktryckeri AB, 1945.

Schlatter, Adolf. Johannes der Täufer. Edited by Wilhelm Michaelis. Basel: Verlag Friedrich Reinhardt AG, 1956.

Schmidt, K. L. Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1964 (1919).

Stauffer, Ethelbert. New Testament Theology. London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1955.

Strack, Hermann L., and Billerbeck, Paul. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. Vol. IV, Pt. 2: Exkurse zu einzelnen Stellen des Neuen Testaments. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1928.

Wilckens, Ulrich. Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte. 2nd ed. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag des Erziehungsvereins, 1963.

C. Articles

Benko, Stephen, "The Magnificat: A History of the Controversy," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVI (September, 1967), 263-275.

Benoit, Pierre. "L'Enfance de Jean-Baptiste selon Luc I," New Testament Studies, III (May, 1957), 169-194.

_____. "'Et toi-même, un glaive te transpercera l'âme!' (Luc 2,35)," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXV (July, 1963), 251-261.

Brockington, L. H. "The Septuagintal Background to the New Testament Use of DOXA," Studies in the Gospels. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957, pp. 1-8.

Cadbury, Henry J. "Acts and Eschatology," The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology. Edited by W. D. Davies and D. Daube. Cambridge: At the University Press, 1954, pp. 300-321.

_____. "Four Features of Lucan Style," Studies in Luke-Acts. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966, pp. 87-102.

Cambe, M. "La Charis chez Saint Luc," Revue Biblique, LXX, 2 (1963), 193-207.

Conzelmann, Hans. "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity," Studies in Luke-Acts. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966, pp. 298-316.

_____. "Zur Lukasanalyse," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, XLIX, 1 (1952), 16-33.

Craghan, John F. "A Redactional Study of Lk 7,21 in the Light of Dt 19,15," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXIX (July, 1967), 47-61 (353-367).

Davies, J. G. "The Prefigurement of the Ascension in the Third Gospel," Journal of Theological Studies, N.S. VI (October, 1955), 229-235.

Davies, J. H. "The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," Studia Evangelica II ("Texte und Untersuchungen 87"). Edited by F. L. Cross. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964, pp. 164-169.

Dibelius, Martin. "Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind. Untersuchungen zur Geburtsgeschichte Jesu im Lukas-Evangelium," Botschaft und Geschichte. Vol. I. Edited by Günther Bornkamm. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1953, pp. 1-78.

Dupont, Jacques. "Le Salut des Gentils et la signification theologique du livre des Actes," New Testament Studies, VI (January, 1960), 132-155.

Dupont, Jacques. "L'ambassade de Jean-Baptiste," Nouvelle Revue Theologique, LXXXIII (September, 1961), 805-821; (November, 1961), 943-959.

Evans, C. F. "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," Studies in the Gospels, Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957, pp. 37-54.

Fascher, Erich. "Theologische Beobachtungen zur dei," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. 2nd ed. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1957, pp. 228-254.

Feuillet, A. "Le recit Lukanien de la tentation (Lc 4,1-13)," Biblica, XL, 3 (1959), 613-631.

Glombitza, Otto. "Der zwölfjährige Jesus, Luk. ii 40-52," Novum Testamentum, V (1962), 1-4.

Goudoever, J. van. "The Place of Israel in Luke's Gospel," Novum Testamentum, VIII (1966), 111-123.

Goulder, M. D. "The Chiastic Structure of the Lucan Journey," Studia Evangelica II ("Texte und Untersuchungen 87"). Edited by F. L. Cross. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964, pp. 195-202.

Goulder, M. D., and Sanderson, M. L. "St. Luke's Genesis," Journal of Theological Studies, N.S. VIII (April, 1957), 12-30.

Grundmann, Walter, "Der Pfingstbericht der Apostelgeschichte in seinem theologischen Sinn," Studia Evangelica II ("Texte und Untersuchungen 87"). Edited by F. L. Cross. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1964, pp. 584-594.

Haenchen, Ernst. "The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity," Studies in Luke-Acts, Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966, pp. 258-278.

Harnack, Adolf von. "Das Magnificat der Elisabeth (Luk. i. 46-55) nebst einigen Bemerkungen zu Luk. i und ii," Studien zur Geschichte des Neuen Testaments und der alten Kirche, I: Zur neutestamentlichen Textkritik. Berlin und Leipzig; 1931, pp. 62-85.

Iersal, B. van. "The Finding of Jesus in the Temple," Novum Testamentum, IV (1960), 161-173.

Jeremias, Joachim. "Ēl(e)ias," Theological Dictionary of the New Testament. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. Vol. II. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman's Publishing Company, 1964, pp. 928-941.

Käsemann, Ernst. "The Disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus," Essays on New Testament Themes ("Studies in Biblical Theology 41"). London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1964, pp. 136-1481

Käsemann, Ernst. "Paul and Nascent Catholicism," Journal for Theology and the Church, III (1967), 14-27.

_____. "The Problem of the Historical Jesus," Essays on New Testament Themes ("Studies in Biblical Theology 41"). London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1964, pp. 15-47.

Lampe, G. W. H. "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke," Studies in the Gospels, Edited by D.E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1957, pp. 159-200.

Laurentin, R. "Traces d'allusions étymologiques en Luc 1-2," Biblica, XXXVII (1956), 435-456.

_____. "Traces d'allusions étymologiques en Luc 1-2 (II)," Biblica, XXXVIII (1957), 1-23.

Leaney, R. "The Birth Narratives in St Luke and St Matthew," New Testament Studies, VIII (January, 1962), 158-166.

Legrand, L. "L'arrière-plan néo-testamentaire de Lc 1,35," Revue Biblique, LXX, 2 (1963), 161-192.

Lohse, Eduard. "Die Bedeutung des Pfingstberichtes im Rahmen des lukanischen Geschichtswerkes," Evangelische Theologie, XIII, 9 (1953), 422-436.

_____. "Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte," Evangelische Theologie, XIV, 6 (1954), 256-275.

Menoud, Philippe H. "Le plan des Actes des Apôtres," New Testament Studies, I (October, 1954), 44-51.

_____. "Remarques sur les textes de l'ascension dans Luc-Actes," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. 2nd ed. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1957, pp. 148-156.

Meyer, Ben F. "But Mary Kept all These Things . . . ," Catholic Biblical Quarterly, XXVI (January, 1964), 31-49.

Minear, Paul S. "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories," Studies in Luke-Acts, Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966, pp. 111-130.

Mussner, Franz. "'In den letzten Tagen' (Apg 2,17a)," Biblische Zeitschrift, V (July, 1961), 263-265.

Oliver, H. H. "The Lucan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts," New Testament Studies, X (January, 1964), 202-226.

Reicke, Bo. "Instruction and Discussion in the Travel Narrative," Studia Evangelica ("Texte und Untersuchungen 73"). Edited by Kurt Aland et al. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959, pp. 206-216.

Reumann, John. "Oikonomia-Terms in Paul in comparison with Lucan Heilsgeschichte," New Testament Studies, XIII (January, 1967), 147-167.

Richter, G. "'Bist du Elias?' (Joh. 1,21)," Biblische Zeitschrift, VI (1962), 79-92; 238-256; VII (1963), 63-80.

Robinson, J. A. T. "Elijah, John and Jesus," Twelve New Testament Studies ("Studies in Biblical Theology 34"). London: SCM Press, Ltd., 1962, pp. 28-52.

Robinson, W. C., Jr. "The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXIX (March, 1960), 20-31.

Schubert, Paul. "The Final Cycle of Speeches in the Book of Acts," Journal of Biblical Literature, LXXXVII (March, 1968), 1-16.

_____. "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann. 2nd ed. Edited by Walther Eltester. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1957, pp. 165-186.

Schulz, Siegfried. "Gottes Vorsehung bei Lukas," Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, LIV (1963), 104-116.

Stempvoort, P. A. van. "The Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke and Acts," New Testament Studies, V (October, 1958), 30-42.

Talbert, C. H. "An Anti-Gnostic Tendency in Lucan Christology," New Testament Studies, XIV (January, 1968), 259-271.

Tatum, W. Barnes. "The Epoch of Israel: Luke I and II and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts," New Testament Studies, XIII (January, 1967), 184-195.

Turner, Nigel. "The Relation of LukeI and II to Hebraic Sources and to the Rest of Luke-Acts," New Testament Studies, II (January, 1956), 100-109.

Vanhoye, Albert. "Structure du 'Benedictus'," New Testament Studies, XII (July, 1966), 382-389.

Vielhauer, Philipp. "Das Benedictus des Zacharias (Luk. 1, 68-79)," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, XLIX (1952), 255-272.

_____. "On the 'Paulism' of Acts," Studies in Luke-Acts. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966, pp. 33-50.

Wilckens, Ulrich. "Interpreting Luke-Acts in a Period of Existentialist Theology," Studies in Luke-Acts. Edited by Leander E Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966, pp. 60-83.

Wilson, R. McL. "Some Recent Studies in the Lucan Infancy Narratives," Studia Evangelica ("Texte und Untersuchungen 73"). Edited by Kurt Aland et al. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959, pp. 235-2531

Winter, Paul. "Magnificat and Benedictus--Maccabaean Psalms?" Bulletin of John Rylands Library, XXXVII (September, 1954), 328-347.

_____. "On the Margin of Luke I, II," Studia Theologica, XII, 1 (1958), 103-107.

_____. "The Proto-Source of Luke I," Novum Testamentum, I (1956), 184-199.

_____. "Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel," New Testament Studies, I (January, 1955), 111-121.